# DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 148 537 RC 010 272

AUTHOR Moreno, Dan, Ed.; And Others
TITLE The Political Economy of Institutional Change: Proceedings of the Ethnic Studies Symposium (1977).
SPONS AGENCY California Univ., Irvine.
PUB DATE 77
NOTE 130p.; The symposium was sponsored by the Program in Comparative Culture of the Univ. of California, Irvine

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Articulation (Program); *Change Strategies; Educational Alternatives; *Educational Change; *Educational Economics; Educational Policy; Ethnic Groups; *Ethnic Studies; Faculty; Finance Reform; Higher Education; Institutional Role; *Interdisciplinary Approach; Policy Formation; Power Structure; Program Content; Role Conflict; Symposia
IDENTIFIERS Chicanos

ABSTRACT

Among the most crucial economic cutbacks were those directed at the minimal gains Asians, Blacks, Chicanos, and Native American communities had attained in an intensive ten-year struggle for education, particularly the Ethnic Studies programs. Consisting of three panels, the symposium critically examined the common base that Ethnic Studies programs share among themselves. The first panel led off the symposium with a series of critical overviews regarding the methodological parameters of Ethnic Studies. The discussion evolved along the general themes of the relationship of Ethnic Studies to other disciplines (e.g., sociology or Marxist Studies) and to those communities they presumably represent, the role of Ethnic scholarship as a vehicle of revolutionary change, and the contributory position imposed on Ethnic Studies by the university vis-a-vis ideological criteria. The second panel addressed and delineated the politics of Ethnic Studies and policy making in higher education; and in so doing, placed the development of these academic units in a larger context of the dialects of the university and U.S. society. The third panel's discussion centered on the following themes: the relationship between the political economy of higher education and the development of Ethnic Studies; the dialectics of class and race relations in higher education; Ethnic Studies as class struggle; higher education and the labor market; and Marxism/Cultural nationalism and the Third World Student. (Author/NQ)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED148537

# The Political Economy of Institutional Change: Proceedings of the Ethnic Studies Symposium

sponsored by
**Program in Comparative Culture**
**University of California, Irvine**
**1977**

*General Editors: Dan Moreno, Rudy Torres*
*Assistant Editor: Majadi Imara*

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH.
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
[illegible]
Program in Comparative Culture
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM

JAN 1978
ERIC/CRESS
RECEIVED

RC010272

# ERRATA

| | |
|---|---|
| P. 29 | Velia Garcia's conclusion can be found on p. 34 |
| P. 30 | Kuregiy Hekijmara should be Kuregiẏ Hekÿmara |
| P. 60 | Barbara Jackson should be Beverly Jackson |
| P. 101 | O. Karenga should be R. Karenga |

Corrections have been made

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

General Introduction . . . . . 1

Mini Introduction--Panel I . . . . . 6

Jose B. Cuellar. . . . . . 7

Mario Barrera. . . . . . 16

Velia Garcia . . . . . 24

Kuregiy Hekymara . . . . . 30

Luis Arroyo. . . . . . 35

Mini Introduction--Panel II. . . . . . 40a

Gilbert Gonzalez . . . . . 41

Tomas Almaguer . . . . . 45

Pete Clecak. . . . . . 56

Beverly Jackson. . . . . . 60

Ronald Takaki. . . . . . 63

Discussion . . . . . 68

Mini Introduction--Panel III . . . . . 83

Majadi Imara . . . . . 84

Stanley Aronowitz. . . . . . 93

R. Karenga . . . . . 101

Carlos Muñoz . . . . . 112

Ronald Takaki. . . . . . 118

## CONTRIBUTORS

Tomas Almaguer - University of California, Berkeley

Luis Arroyo -- University of California, Los Angeles

Stanley Aronowitz - University of California, Irvine

Mario Barrera - University of California, Los Angeles

Pete Clecak - University of California, Irvine

Jose Cuellar - Claremont Colleges

Velia Garcia - University of California, Berkeley

Gilbert Gonzalez - University of California, Irvine

Kuregiỳ Hekỳmara - Claremont Colleges

Majadi Imara - University of California, Irvine

Beverly Jackson - Claremont Colleges

Ron Karenga - University of California, San Diego

Carlos Muñoz - University of California, Berkeley

Ronald Takaki - University of California Berkeley

## SYMPOSIUM COORDINATORS

Dan Moreno - University of Colorado, Boulder

Rudy Torres - Claremont Graduate School

Majadi Imara - University of California, Irvine

Direct Inquiries to:

Dan Moreno
University of Colorado, Boulder
Chicano Studies Department
Boulder, Colorado 80303

# INTRODUCTION

United States capitalism is today recovering from its most serious recession since the 1930's. High profit rates have resumed for U.S. corporations, worker productivity is on the upswing, and generally, capital accumulation has resumed.[1] But at what cost?

The Federal Government in the last five years has made massive cutbacks in federal aid to education, social welfare and such anti-poverty programs as day care for children of working mothers. It is ironic that the 40 million people in that sector of the economy, the majority of whom are national minorities and white working class dependent to some extent on public funds and public welfare, have suffered enormously because of these cutbacks. The irony is that this population has literally subsidized the higher accumulation rates that were necessary to offset Imperialist failures throughout the world during the 1960's and 1970's.

This strategy of reducing social spending by cutting areas that failed to produce capital took specific form vis-a-vis revenue sharing, which in general reduced the kinds and quality of schools, housing and welfare available to local governments unable to match federal funds. Obviously, national

---

[1] We owe part of our analysis of U.S. political economy to interaction with Stanley Aronowitz, who has published portions of this position in Le Monde Diplomatique, "La Strategie de L'inegalite: Partage des revenus et regression sociale."

minorities clustered in decaying urban centers absorbed the brunt of this economic maneuver. Among the most crucial cutbacks are those being directed at the minimal gains Asians, Blacks, Chicanos, and Native American communities have attained in an intensive ten-year struggle for education. Ethnic Studies programs in particular have been singled out for the cutting block. The paring away of these academic units is more than simple cost cutting, however. Ethnic Studies programs, paraphrasing Andre Gortz, were part of the wave of "non-reformist reforms" that crested University opposition to U.S. Imperialist policy in the 1960's. Ethnic Studies programs collectively played a major role in opposing U.S. exploitation of the Third World and fought major battles against Institutional Racism within the University, as well as heightening the political consciousness of a generation of predominantly white middle class youth and faculty. This ideological threat to U.S. hegemony became all the more potent with the socialist tendency that has emerged among these groups since the late 1960's. During this period militant activism by minority communities directed at social inequities in higher education clearly showed the failure of universities and colleges nationally to serve with equity all segments of society. This social protest pointed to structural as well as class and racial inequities in American society.

This emergent contradiction between the educational system and the new conditions of economic life underlies the political dynamics of the past fifteen years. As in previous periods of rapid integration of groups into the wage-labor system, the contemporary period is marked by violent struggle--struggle with a class basis accelerated by notions of race and exacerbated rather than lessened by the educational system. And as in previous periods, we witness a proliferation of analyses and proposals for educational change, only some of which are compatible with the further consolidation of the corporate capitalist system.

The development of a critique of higher education vis-a-vis the U.S. class structure was a response to the national sentiments which were the impetus underlying the dynamics of educational reform and protest. Rather quickly, the universities found themselves entangled with the problem of demonstrating the presumed democratic character of higher education. This emerging contradiction between higher education and the new conditions of economic life underscores the political dynamics of policy change that is sweeping higher education. The most recent example of this contradiction is the Bakke decision, which is presently being considered by the United States Supreme Court. Allen Bakke, a white male, filed a suit against the University of California Regents, arguing that he was the victim of racial discrimination. He contended that he was not admitted to medical school at U.C. Davis due to a special admissions program which reserves a percentage of admissions to members of four minority groups: Asians, Blacks, Chicanos and Native Americans. The California Supreme Court, in ruling against the University's case (which many legal authorities considered suspiciously weak), supported the reverse racism charge at the heart of the suit, and used the 14th Amendment to mediate the inherent class and race contradictions guised in the concept of "social harmony".

Unfortunately, some "progressive" organizations have reduced this contradiction to a question of nationality, and have systematically ignored the class character of this decision. It is our belief that in order to come to grips with the political economy of Ethnic Studies as exemplified in issues raised by the Bakke decision, one must discern the relationship between capitalism and higher education.

What is increasingly obvious is that the national publicity on open enrollments have created a false impression that national minorities have reached parity with dominant society for their groups, and that special programs, i.e., E.O.P., prison programs, community outreach, special admissions, etc. are no longer necessary. Given the face that educational policies are being fundamentally reshaped by U.S. capitalism, it is clear that Third World struggles must incorporate this phenomenon into future strategies for educational change.

Our intentions in publishing the proceedings of this symposium are simple. To spur dialogue, raise issues and critically examine the common base that Ethnic Studies programs share among themselves. Can any of the major policy and institutional recommendations which emerged from this symposium and listed in this document be widely applied to Asian, Black, Chicano and Native American programs? Should this base incorporate other

Progressive forces that also struggle against racism, sexism and classism?

Danny Moreno
Program in Comparative Culture
University of California
Irvine, California

Rudy Torres
Claremont Graduate School
Claremont, California

## Mini Introduction
## Panel I

This discussion was designed to lead off the symposium with a series of critical overviews regarding the methodological parameters of Ethnic Studies. The discussion evolved along the following general themes: Relationship of Ethnic Studies to other disciplines--i.e. sociology or Marxist studies; the relationship of Ethnic Studies to these communities they presumably represent; the role of Ethnic scholarship as a vehicle of revolutionary change; the contributory position imposed on Ethnic Studies by the university vis-a-vis ideological criteria.

## JOSE B. CUELLAR

Contemporary Ethnic Studies emerged as an academic response to the postwar conditions of nationalism, urbanization, and the population explosion among Third World peoples. The development of Ethnic Studies as a distinct field of specialization can be related to the "crisis of criticism" in academic disciplines, particularly those in the field of social science. During the last two decades, the rise of Ethnic Studies may also be related to the forces that contributed to the recent development of other postwar fields of specialization which are also oriented toward the needs of specific populations in a stratified society such as Gerontology, Urban Studies, and Women's Studies.

If Kuhn is correct about factors related to the genesis and continuation of research traditions, the future of Ethnic Studies as a field of specialization depends on the satisfaction of certain prerequisites. These include 1) the commitment of a group of practitioners; 2) the development of a shared perspective; and 3) the development of some standards and rules for praxis.

My concern here is with the nature of the shared commitments and perspectives of practitioners in the field of Ethnic Studies. During the last decade, Ethnic Studies developed as little more than a composite of disciplines responding to the specific needs of distinct populations. If Ethnic Studies is to survive its practitioners must come to agree upon certain fundamental orientations, rules and standards of practice. One of our basic tasks is to examine the extent to which practitioners in the various Ethnic Studies disciplines already share basic commitments and perspectives. Toward this end, I want to review the rise of Chicano Studies, one Ethnic Studies discipline, in order to isolate the basic elements and premises of an emergent paradigm. This should allow us to later contrast them against those of practitioners in other Ethnic Studies disciplines and draw implications about the present and future status of Ethnic Studies as a field of specialization.

## THE RISE OF CHICANO STUDIES

Chicano Studies was first defined in El Plan de Santa Barbara as "the formal, institutionalized, and dynamic study of Chicano culture in all of its diversity and unity"; it is the academic examination of every facet of the Chicano experience--from language, literature, aesthetics and creative arts, philosophy, folklore and ideology to the objective conditions of its historical, social, cultural, psychological, political and economic socialization, development and existence. Its aim has been to promote the socio-cultural, material and intellectual welfare and achievement of the community of Mexican descent in the United States.

Chicano Studies has evolved dynamically in several different dimensions during the last decade: 1) as an institutionalized disciplines; 2) as a body of critical and empirical knowledge; 3) as a transdisciplinary approach; and 4) as a group of individual practitioners in persisting relations with one another and with common interests that arise from their common activities.

The postwar conditions of nationalism, urbanization and population explosion manifested themselves in the Chicano "civil rights" and "student" movements of the last decades. Chicano Studies as a discipline emerged as a specific response to the demands of activists and students. It was originally conceived as a part of a people's struggle for equality and justice, and as a means to meet the growing need for accurate analysis of the strategic needs, progress, development, and self determination of the Mexican community in the United States. Chicano Studies was also originally proposed as a means of forming compleat persons who truly value life and freedom.

With self determination as a guiding principle, Chicano Studies bears the responsibility for the Chicano community's educational, research and public service needs. In 1968, the first goals of Chicano Studies were defined as follows:
1) to increase the proportion of Chicanos in higher education;
2) to develop a curriculum consistent with the Chicano historical experience; and 3) to establish research, cultural and social action programs to meet the needs of the community.

Since 1968, Chicano Studies has been institutionalized as academic programs with subfields or areas of specialization in the humanities, the social sciences, and the applied professions. The "applied" dimension is founded on the notion that the University must work for the people. And although the application of research findings to the needs of the community is the primary aim of the disciplines as a whole, the applied area emphasizes research and training of service providers in the areas of health, education, social and legal welfare.

It is important to note that the distinctions between the subfields of Chicano social science and Chicano humanities reflect differences in styles of thought and approaches to knowledge, the characteristics of the broader academic traditions to which each can be linked, rather than fundamental differences in perspective or commitment. Indeed, the difference between a social science specialist and a humanities specialist in Chicano Studies is one of emphasis required by the division of scholarly labor rather than one of differences in basic interests, concerns, purposes, and subject matter. Still, given the objective conditions and needs of the Chicano community, it is not surprising to find that a greater curricular and research emphasis has been given to the subfield of Chicano social science.

As a body of critical and empirical knowledge, Chicano social science has developed as an independent response to the felt need for self definition among the growing number of critical Chicano students in traditional social science disciplines. These students, sharing the notion that the analytic boundaries of their disciplines were too restrictive, first prepared technical critiques of studies of Chicanos by dominant scholars.

If we agree with Kuhn that a "paradigm" is an unprecedented academic achievement that attracts an enduring group of practitioners away from competing modes of activity, and at the same time is sufficiently open-ended to leave all sorts of problems for the new group of practitioners to resolve, then we can trace the origins of contemporary Chicano social science and Chicano studies to the pioneer critical work of Octavio Romano-V. and Ralph Guzman in anthropology and political science. These served as models for critical reviews by others.

The conclusions shared by the critical students in various disciplines were that most studies suffered from: 1) a paucity of reliable data; 2) theoretical and methodological deficiencies; 3) failure to consider the effects of subjective factors in research, particularly political ideology; and 4) failure to consider the needs of the community of Mexican descent during the course of the research.

The basic paradigm advanced by these critical students was one that rejected 1) explanations of the Chicano conditions solely on the basis of genetics or cultural determinism; 2) romanticized descriptions of the Chicano; 3) use of improper and unethical research procedures in the process of developing a body of critical and empirical knowledge and data grounded in social reality. It accepted explanations based on theories of relationships between the conditions of individuals in the communities of Mexican descent and the economic, political, socio-cultural, and historical forces that mold and serve as their environments.

As a transdisciplinary approach with its own emergent assumptions, concerns, problems, questions and operations, Chicano social science emphasizes certain dimensions: the "critical", the "reflexive", and the "holistic". The critical dimension requires a rigorous analysis and critique of dominant perspectives and institutions. The reflexive dimension assumes that the "insider" has privileged access to strategic knowledge by virtue of social position which permits the insider as researcher to "reflect" upon personal life experience--to interface the autobiographical with the historical, the individual with the general--in the selection of research problems and orientations. The reflexive dimension permits the researcher to examine and expose unstated biases and assumptions that may affect his research and to develop an understanding of the Chicano condition from a subordinate position and perspective.

The holistic dimension requires a multimethod and multilevel analysis; one that reduces fragmentation of knowledge on the Chicano experience by ranging in focus from the intersubjective to the institutional, from the local and particular to the international and universal. The holistic dimension also requires a historical perspective that emphasizes the analytical significance of the Mexican's modes of entry into the United States, and the relationship between the socio-cultural differentiation and economic structure of the dominant society and the low status of the Chicanos.

In the process of development, Chicano social scientists have committed themselves to several standards and rules for praxis. The general commitment is to practical, problem-oriented research to meet the needs of the community, and to action scholarship for liberation. The nature of the action of scholarship is to be dictated by the needs and problems of the community rather than by the theories and values of dominant scholars. There is a commitment to employ those methodological strategies that emphasize the researcher's close contact with the people and theoretical models grounded in empirical data and social reality. Chicano social science is committed to making the process of social research a collective effort between the researcher and the community, with the members of the community being treated as equals. Chicano social science is committed to making the University work for the people, and encouraging others to reexamine their orientations and perspectives. It is also committed to a research emphasis on the development of the community of Mexican descent in relationship to the dominant institutions of United States society.

A number of salient needs and problems in Chicano social science have been identified within the emergent paradigm. Some of these are 1) the need for comparative studies between Chicanos and others in the regional, national and international economies; 2) historical analyses of the international relationships between the United States community of Mexican descent and the Republic of Mexico; 3) analyses of the role and function of "the border"; and 4) an emphasis on urban realities in the development of "future" research.

As a group of committed practitioners, Chicano social scientists have maintained enduring formal relationships since the first National Caucus of Chicano Social Scientists in 1972. Their articulated common concerns have centered on 1) the continued critical assessment and evaluation of the body of social science knowledge and on the community of Mexican descent in the United States; 2) the development of policy guidelines for the conduct of research on the community of Mexican descent; 3) the establishment of priorities regarding basic and applied research in the community; 4) the formulation of a code of ethics for action scholars; and 5) the development of ways to increase the number of Chicano specialists in social science.

Some of their common goals are 1) to develop communication channels between action scholars; 2) to create an ambience for the development of adequate theories and models of analysis; 3) to increase the proportion of Chicanos in social science; and 4) to increase the flow of funds to support Chicano research activities.

## CONCLUSIONS

In sum, as a component of Ethnic Studies, Chicano Studies has emerged in response to postwar historical conditions. Like other research traditions, Chicano Studies has satisfied certain prerequisites. A group of committed practitioners who consider themselves specialists in the discipline have developed a shared perspective and a commitment to certain standards and rules. The unprecedented achievement or paradigm that attracted an enduring group of Chicano Studies practitioners is one that emphasizes its critical, reflexive and holistic dimensions. The commitment of the Chicano Social Scientist and Chicano Studies scholar is to academic action for liberation.

## MARIO BARRERA

This is, in a way, kind of a continuation of what Jose Cuellar was saying earlier. He talked about some of the early history of Chicano studies and some of the assumptions that went into it. I would like to focus my comments here on what I see as being the present status of Chicano studies. Although I am addressing my remarks to Chicano studies, I suspect that many of the other ethnic and racial programs have similar kinds of problems.

Up to now, the assumption behind Chicano studies has been that Chicano studies as a field of study consists of all studies that are done on the Chicano. This is what I call the "inclusive" definition of Chicano studies. Now the problem with this definition is that studies that have been focused on the Chicano experience are not done in a vacuum, but are usually done by people that have been trained in a particular academic discipline and, generally, reflect the biases and assumptions that have shaped that discipline, whether it is history, political science, or psychology. Another problem with this particular approach, that is, the inclusive definition of Chicano studies, is that there is really no fundamental need for there to be a program like Chicano studies or Ethnic Studies in general, or at least no long-term need, because there is really no distinct contribution that Chicano studies can make that couldn't be assimilated into the existing departments once they were familiarized to doing this kind of study.

The alternative approach is the one that I would like to advocate here today, and that is what I call an "exclusive" definition of Chicano Studies. This definition assumes that Chicano studies incorporates an approach that transcends the normal disciplines, what we normally think of as the academic disciplines in the American universities. What I am proposing is the following: Chicano studies is an area of study that focuses on the experience of a particular people, the Chicanos. The appropriate approach to this study is one that is integrative rather than fragmented. A high degree of integration in Chicano studies can be reached not only once, but through a series of approximations.

In his book, Labor and Monopoly Capital, Harry Braverman describes the application of Taylor's system of scientific management to the labor process under the capitalist system. Under scientific management, the work process is progressively broken down into component processes which are performed by different workers, no one of whom has a conception of the entire process. The application of this kind of principle to the work process is captured in Charlie Chaplin's film Modern Times. If you have seen that, you will remember that Chaplin goes to work on the assembly line, and he spends all day turning screws like this with both hands. At the end of the work day, you see him leaving the factory and walking down the street still turning screws with both hands. In some ways, this points to a similar kind of process that you find in the university; the study of the human experience is broken down into various components like economics, politics, social relations, art, literature, psychological processes, etc., each of these being studied by different intellectual workers in a very fragmented manner. So the result of this is that you have a very large, nonintegrated body of knowledge, and you have a work process in which none of the workers has an overall conception of the scope or purpose of the enterprise that they are engaged in. Now all of us who are in the university or doing research have been trained in this manner, and all of us to one degree or another have internalized the assumption that underlies that.

What I am proposing is that we need to break down these divisions in order to gain a more comprehensive view of the Chicano experience. By way of accomplishing this, Chicano scholars who are committed to Chicano studies must establish an interdisciplinary network, which coordinates theoretical and research efforts. For example, people in sociology, political science, economics, and history form a kind of natural grouping in that we often study processes that are very closely related. Likewise, linguistics, education and psychology constitute another kind of grouping of disciplines, just as drama, literature and art are another grouping. In other words, I think there are natural groupings that can serve as approximations in order to try to bring together these people who have been trained in different disciplines and different approaches and now find themselves carrying on research on the Chicano. Some of this, in fact, is going on already in the field of Chicano labor. For example, you find a sociologist, a political scientist, and an historian working together, coming together in conferences, sharing papers with each other, etc. This is the kind of approach I think is appropriate to Chicano studies as an extended field of study.

But what are the issues and some of the problems and major dilemmas that are faced by people engaged in this kind of work? One of these issues is that if a person commits himself to this kind of an approach, what will be the relationship with other disciplines that exist in the university? My feeling is that Chicano studies as an integrated approach would draw specific information from the established disciplines. At the same time, it would be working to transcend these disciplines. In this regard, I think Chicano studies should also have a special relationship to Marxist work on campus to the extent that Marxist studies exist on a particular campus. This relationship is important for two reasons:

1) Marxism as a method of study is the only currently viable approach which is integrated in the manner that I have described above. Unfortunately, there is the sense that Marxism attempts to break down divisions by attempts to look

at the broad range of human experience and integrate it under one heading. Unfortunately, up to this point the field of Ethnic and racial studies has been one of the weakest areas of Marxist studies. I think there are reasons for that. I don't think it is necessarily an inherent limitation of Marxism as a method. I think it is one that can be overcome.

2) The second reason that I think that Chicano studies should have a working relationship to Marxism as a body of knowledge is to provide the context for Chicano studies through its analysis of a capitalist society and of international relations. So, in other words, I don't think that Chicano studies should be studied in an isolated kind of manner. The Chicano is a part of the capitalist society. In order to understand the historical experience of the Chicano, you have to understand how the capitalist system works, and Marxism provides the best body of knowledge for understanding the workings of the capitalist system.

The second issue that I want to talk about in relation to this question is that of academic survival for the researcher who commits himself to this kind of approach. One of the problems that we have had in Chicano studies and all Ethnic Studies programs up to this point is that we have always had to be concerned with survival on a day-to-day basis. Ethnic Studies has been in such a precarious position at the university that it has been very hard for us to step back and take a long-range view of the problems. We have been concerned with day-to-day and year-to-year survival, and that is just as true today, perhaps more true today, than it has been in the past.

The university is primarily organized along disciplinary lines, which is reflected in the way in which people organize themselves in professional associations. When a Chicano gets a Ph.D. in political science, sociology, literature, or whatever, he or she is faced with a question of whether he wants to affiliate himself with the department in which he was trained or a similar department, or whether he wants to affiliate with the Chicano studies program or department, or perhaps in some cases people affiliate themselves with both. A closely-related problem here, and I have seen many people face this decision in the last few years, is where are they going to publish their material? Are they going to publish it in journals like Aztlan, for example, which are committed to an interdisciplinary study of the Chicano experience, or in broadly Marxist journals, or in the American Political Science Review. This will influence the kind of work they will do, because it has to follow a certain format. There is no real answer to this. I have seen people working in both areas.

Thirdly is the question of vulnerability to criticism. To the extent that a person commits himself to study, it means that he will become more open to criticism, because he is trying to cover a broader range of material than one committed to only one field. They will have to train themselves to become proficient in both areas and learn to accept criticism and respond in a positive manner. Hopefully, the results will pay off in time. Another aspect when we make criticism of each other's work is that criticism should be made in a positive and helpful manner and not in a way of exposing weaknesses. Criticism in the university should not be destructive in manner. People tend to build up by tearing down. If we do this in Chicano studies, it doesn't contribute to anything. Both from receiving and giving criticism we need to reinforce.

The field of history is a crucial one at this time. One reason is that we have social scientists in the process of trying to become more historical in their approach.*

The second reason that the field of history is very crucial is that a very strong group of Ph.D.'s have emerged from the universities and have published in journals and are joining Chicano historians at this time.

Thirdly, history is important now because there is ambivalence among Chicano historians as a discipline figuring out how to orient themselves as historians in this respect, because of what appears to be a high degree of acceptance by historians. History is a long-standing discipline tracing its origin back thousands of years. In spite of differences, it is necessary for historians to become systematically theoretical so that we can deal with problems of industry and the university. To this extent, major contributions will be made.

---

*An example of this is the research being done by the graduate students who organized this symposium, Dan Moreno from the Program in Comparative Culture, UC Irvine, and Rudy Torres at Claremont Graduate School.

## VELIA GARCIA

I have titled my remarks today "Models and Muddles", or "Problems and Issues in Building Ethnic Studies". Although I have been teaching mainly in Chicano studies, I have also taught courses in Ethnic Studies, and my commitment is primarily toward the building of an integral Ethnic Studies program.

For the purposes of this discussion, I would like to begin with some observations about the role of Ethnic Studies programs on the university campus that are intended to put into context some of their problematic and programatic features. First, it is important to emphasize the role of the university as a key institution in the ideological superstructure of capitalism. To understand the nature and implications of the academic and ideological roles of Ethnic Studies, one must take into account the relationship of ideology to material relations. This is an exercise that explodes the myth of value-free science and lays a basis for a critical counter-thrust. We must recognize that the social functions of knowledge are defined in terms of the ideological imperatives of the U.S. capitalist system--a system in which Third World peoples have been subjugated on the basis of race and class.

Mainstream social science has played a key role in this respect. Thus, academic elites from traditional disciplines are accorded wide-ranging public platforms designed to legitimatize their work as objective, value-free contributions to knowledge with important social policy implications. Economist Milton Friedman, anthropologist Oscar Lewis, and sociologist Daniel Patrick Moynihan are good examples of academic ideologues whose works have shaped public policy from the "War on Poverty" through "benign neglect". Under the guise of liberal reform, they have pointed the way to ever more sophisticated forms of racial and class oppression. Such are the social functions of knowledge.

It is in this context that Ethnic Studies as an academic program and developing discipline exists as a counterthrust--real, perceived, or potential--to the ideological hegemony that characterizes the modern university. This seems to be true despite the sometimes uneven, imperfect and coopted implementation of Ethnic Studies programs that have occurred in various situations and instances. Programs that proceed in a misguided or incoherent manner may be no more likely to be missed. Thus, the perceived ideological potential of Ethnic Studies may be as important in determinining the response of university hierarchy as is the real effectiveness of our programs.

The role of Third World scholars as academic ideologues and Ethnic Studies programs as a more or less progressive counterthrust is central to our development in at least two ways. 1) It points out the directions that Ethnic Studies must pursue if it is to be effective at institutional change, and 2) it helps to clarify the source of many of the problems that have encumbered our development every step of the way.

With these prefatory remarks, I would like to turn to a consideration of some of the problems and programatic issues that we face in building Ethnic Studies. To a large extent, these flow logically from the nature of our presence on campus. Some of these issues and problems include: 1) establishing and legitimizing a critical perspective; 2) creating new models for teaching and research; 3) breaking down the social relations of the classroom; and 4) developing an integral Ethnic Studies perspective.

Establishing a truly critical perspective in Ethnic Studies can be hindered, and has been, by scholars who develop a false basis in terms of faulty methodology of ethnocentrism. In this regard, our relations with the community to which we give such ardent lip service can support our efferts. Our communities are engaged through their organized action in daily definition of the relevant points of criticism that can help guide our efforts on campus. Typically, the focus of community action is on the oppressive material conditions that affect their daily life. As Third World scholars, we must struggle against becoming so enamored with the skills we develop in doing social science that we fail to recognize reality or ask the right kinds of questions. Thus, we must emphasize praxis in our teaching as well as our research efforts.

We need to strengthen and develop methods of involving students in exploring all aspects of the critical perspective defined through community struggles.

The socializing impact of academic hegemony mitigates against our development of creative new models for teaching and research and thus threatens our self-determination. Paulo Freire talks about the tendency of oppressed people to recreate themselves in the images of their oppressors. Middle class academics (students and faculty) are very susceptible to this tendency. In 1969, Nathan Hare, in discussing the challenge to the Black scholar, noted:

> "The Black scholar must develop new and appropriate norms and values, new institutional structures, and in order to be effective in this regard, he must also develop and be guided by a new methodology, though in some regards it will subsume and overlap existing norms of scholarly endeavor. He must achieve a Black perspective of all his training and experience, so that his scholarly tools can become effective instruments for Black liberation."

Hare's admonition is as clearly imperative today as it was in 1969. We must not underestimate the socializing impact of liberal academic hegemony and of academic colonialism on our creative abilities. We are none of us immune. Ethnic Studies faculty have a special responsibility to initiate processes of intellectual decolonization. We must be aggressive, therefore, in asserting the legitimacy of our academic endeavors and creative in developing new models for teaching and research with new ethical bases and methodological approaches.

Nowhere is a lack of new models more apparent than in the classroom, where the responsibility of faculty to inspire and correctly guide students is critical. The problems are numerous. In my own past six years of teaching, I have found that it is extremely difficult to break down the social relations of the classroom. Students are well prepared as individuals throughout their educational experiences and find it extremely difficult to work collectively. It is very important for our students to develop collective work, since it is the basis for progress in Ethnic Studies.

Another problem in the classroom has to be with what Freire calls the "banking concept of education". That is, the subjugation of the students in the classroom as individuals without knowledge, without contributions to make, sitting there as receptors for the knowledge that spews forth from the learned professor in front of the classroom. Students throughout their educational experiences have been taught discipline effectively and, therefore, are very often unable to break through this banking concept bind. One way I have found to work around this problem is allowing students in the classroom to make concrete contributions to the struggles on campus and in the community. Students need to be able to produce useful work, rather than abstract papers that end up in the waste basket at the end of the quarter. Students need to be able to contribute to community efforts, to defend committee efforts, to struggles over border issues, to problems of immigration, to preparing testimony for the penal reform committees of the legislature that attempt to address the inequities of the criminal justice system. These efforts demonstrate to students the real power that they hold as scholars. Additionally, students need to be encouraged more to work in groups within the classrooms and in whatever kinds of research that they do. It is wasted effort for us to proceed individually and productive of us to work together. This can be accomplished in the classroom.

One of our most serious difficulties has been in developing an integral Ethnic Studies approach that does justice to the concrete academic, historical and ideological bases that form the underdeveloped foundation of all Ethnic Studies programs. Again, the aspect of cultural nationalism or the extension of individualism inhibits collective creativity as we sieze upon the very issues of cultural and social differences that constitute the ideology of race and class divisions.

Unquestionably, the pressures of the university to conform to established standards have made it more expedient to pursue independent development as Asian Studies, Native American Studies, Chicano Studies, and Black Studies. So too, the organization of knowledge in the academy into discreet disciplines inhibit our multidisciplinary and transdisciplinary

see page 34. for conclusion

HEKYMARA
KUREGIY ~~HEKIJMARA~~

In every year of every decade and every decade of every century, there are a people struggling to liberate themselves from the tyranny and exploitation by other people of the world.

In this year, decade, century, it is Black people who are struggling to liberate themselves from the tyranny and exploitation by non-Blacks and in some cases from other Blacks. Examples: America, South America, Angola, Mozambique, Ethiopia, South Africa, Uganda, Rhodesia, etc.

What is exploitation? Exploitation can be described as a process whereby one individual or group of individuals persuade and/or force another individual or group into a position where they are manipulated to propagate the survival, comfort and happiness of others at the expense of their own. For Blacks, this process can best be described as colonization.

What is colonization? In general terms, colonization can be subdivided into two major categories, the first of which is physical colonization. This is a process where individuals are coerced into participating in activities that they would not otherwise participate in. In this way, physical colonization is directly related to the enmassing and the organization of power and force into a tool of domination. Of course, the process is based on the will of those persons who hold the intent and desire to colonize.

The second category of colonization is mental colonization.

Different from physical colonization, this is a process through which individuals are persuaded and inculcated into accepting a physical position of inferiority. Important too, they are supplied with the rationalization necessary for them to justify submitting to norms which are alien to their own psycho-physical survival as well as their ethnic group. Thus, the logical result of injecting ideas, concepts and ideologies in the minds of Blacks that are alien to their ethnic survival is a mental state of colonization.

Once such a mental state is established, the colonizers can boast of being successful in inculcating their subjects to accept an inferior role to themselves, their ethnic group as well as other groups closest to them.

More often than not, once a mental state of colonization has been established, most colonized individuals will begin to adapt and accommodate their oppressor's norms. They will mimic them physically and conceptually and actively seek one-way integration into a cultural, political and socioeconomic environment that is designed to negate the worth of their personal being. Moreover, at this stage, the colonized individuals will more often than not defend what he or she defines as being his master's values and mores as a norm for their own survival.

With this brief introduction, we can turn our attention to the question of how people are colonized. There are many elements, modes and processes which establish the concepts necessary for developing and solidifying a menial state of colonization. Perhaps the most effective way to examine this phenomenon is to begin by viewing the colonized mind as being the catalyst, ethos or culture where conditions are established for one to normalize an alien psychology, and therefore participate in processes which ensure their own colonization.

For our examination, we will begin by analyzing the relationships of a person's psycho-physical being to his environment. Because we are historically-minded beings, we cannot ignore the phenomena of education--its substances, purposes and goals. To understand education, it is important to identify and examine its relationships to individuality--individuality whether it be individuals or the collective distinctiveness of our ethnic groups, the collective individuality of the Third World. Then if people have and are restricted by their own individuality and education is derived from people, isn't it logical to expect that one's culture, history, values, mores and aspirations will have a direct bearing on their goals and purposes in education? Now recognizing this fact, it becomes clear that the physical and psychological traits of a person or a group of persons are powerful determinants in educational systems. These determinants can be both negative and positive. There is such a thing as positive freedom, there is such a thing as negative freedom; there is such a thing as positive power, there is such a thing as negative power. Which one do we have? Which ones do we have?

In organized society, education has become a prime means through which the personal vices of certain groups and individuals are extended to the collective. This occurs because in the collective, certain personalities or certain personal traits tend to become dominant. Even if one is not fully aware of every other person's individuality or his own behavior, I wonder where should we go here? Should we talk about methodology? I think methodology is a presupposed phenomenon that comes from our ideology.

To shorten my speech further, I will go to my conclusion. Let's talk a little bit about the teacher. In order that teachers and students may experience effective problem definition and problem solving, in spite of bias, racism, or any other kind of -ism, there are basically four things that we as Third World people must realize:

1. Understand the degree of our own negative influences from others.

2. Understand that we are free to act when we know the extent to which the self is restricted by the collective.

3. Understand that processes of change create collective individuality.

4. Establish criteria for protecting the individual from negative collectives.

In short, the absurdity of our own situation eliminates our own collective.

Velia Garcia (cont'd.)

proclivities. Doing our own thing as separate Ethnic Studies programs has drawn us ever further apart in most instances. Instead, we should be proceeding toward the reorganization of our teaching and research that will require faculty and students to be involved in regular interactions, collective efforts, and comparative work. This then, in our final analysis, is our major task to combat any liberal academic hegemony on the university campus. It is in this effort that our paradigms and methodologies will take shape and develop in ways that are consistent with our roles and responsibilities as Ethnic Studies on the college campuses.

## LUIS ARROYO

The title of this panel is "What are some of the issues involved in defining Ethnic Studies as a distinct academic discipline with evolving paradigms and methodologies?"

A question like that begs for some kind of definition. The first problem we are faced with is what do we mean by "Ethnic Studies"? If you have listened closely today, I am sure that you have heard at least three different definitions. For some people, Ethnic Studies is a rubric--in other words, just a label which serves as a label for an academic program or department on a campus within which are to be found academic disciplines such as Chicano studies, Black studies, what have you. For other people, Ethnic Studies seems to function as some kind of ideal situation in which the study of ethnics will come about. These are some of the definitions that were running through the presentations today.

Well, let's talk about these for a little bit. It seems to me that none of us who struggled in the late 1960's to bring about what is today called Ethnic Studies had in mind the creation of programs that would study ethnics. There are white scholars, and very reactionary ones at that, who wish to bring about those kinds of programs which will once again allow the majority of society to dominate Ethnic Studies, which is occurring now as it is. So, in other words, what I am suggesting is that the holistic definition of Ethnic Studies as an academic discipline is another way of depriving minorities of power, because the struggle to create the individual programs--Black studies, Chicano studies--are after all expressions of struggles, expressions of nationalist struggles, as a part of Black, Chicano, Indian or any other group. We have to remember that these programs were brought about as a manifestation of a decolonization process on the part of the people who were waging struggle within the context of the United States. That concept has not been brought up to date in the sense that there was, at one time, an organic relationship between the masses of people who struggled to create programs and the way these programs developed. That kind of tie has been broken over time. One can see it. I would dare say, one of the problems of Ethnic Studies today is that there is no longer an organic relation with the respective bodies of peoples they purport to study. This is the major problem of Ethnic Studies. It is not whether Ethnic Studies or Chicano studies is going to develop a new type of child disciplinary approach to the study; it is exacting what you are going to study. It is the content.

Look at the definitions of these trends. Everyone has mentioned that Black studies, Chicano studies, what have you, focus on the experiences of the particular group in question, but then people go on to emphasize how you are going to approach that experience. I think we should stop. I think that one of the problems of Ethnic Studies is that people have gotten away.

They don't understand--we don't understand--that we are supposed to be studying the concrete realities of our people as they have historically been developed in this society, in the world, and under the different stages of class struggle. What has happened is that we have lost sight of what the content of these programs was to be after all. These programs were not brought about to create academically respectable departments or academically respectable disciplines. So, in many ways, our discussion here today is paradoxical in nature, because much of the thrust has been towards legitimizing these programs in the traditional sense. See--that is the paradox we face. It is in this contradiction that we find ourselves, because it is a concrete contradiction; namely, that we are functioning within an institution that we do not control. It controls us. We ostensibly are trying to serve our respective communities; but on the other hand, we find ourselves oftentimes responding to the demands being placed by the institution, the one that we claim to despise so much. Look at the panels--look at the questions. All of us are caught up with this. We are asking questions about tenure, proper methods of teaching, but we get away from the subject matter.

What are we supposed to be doing? We are supposed to be deriving new knowledge that will help to 1) speed along the colonization process, and 2) bring about struggle for revolutionary changes in the country--that's knowledge. The second part is that we are supposed to be creating participants. We are supposed to be waging epistemological battles. Very few of us do that. Very few of us have clearly in mind that our function is to demystify what capitalism has put into all of our heads. Very few have in mind that we are supposed to be training people for the revolution.

What we are doing now is concerned with problems of academic legitimacy. I think that as long as we talk about academic legitimacy, the question of evolving paradigms and methodology in Ethnic Studies and Chicano studies resolves itself, because essentially we are once again caught up in the traditional discipline of social science in the American university. We are again responding to their definition. I, myself, do not believe that the proper function of Chicano studies, Black studies, or Indian studies is to engage itself with what are essentially traditional academic arguments; namely, should the approach to studying a phenomenon by studying be disciplinary in nature, interdisciplinary in nature, transdisciplinary in nature? Both are old questions. Those are bourgeois question, but we engage in those questions.

We have to remember that the thrust of these studies programs was to bring about change. The change will take place by keeping several things in mind. First, that we are talking about oppressed peoples. We are talking about Third World peoples. We are talking about non-white populations. In doing so, we cannot try to homogenize their experiences by using the term "ethnic". To suggest that we are bringing about some kind of ethnic models that will encompass all of them is to objectify reality to a point that we destroy the unique aspects of the experiences. After all, all of us are products of history, but how that history is affected and how it has been worked out has to be considered on the individual level, on the particular levels and on the universal. We cannot liquidate the nationalist question. We cannot liquidate the aspirations of people to determine their own destinies. One will think that these questions are passe, but they are not. For many of us, unfortunately, we have moved too quickly to grab the Marxist framework and have forgotten that the entire essence of Marxism is to apply historical materialism, dialectical logic, Marxist epistemology to the concrete realities of people. It is not enough to take tracks, to take Marxist work, and consider them like the Bible and apply them "a priori", "a historical" in nature. They have to be applied to concrete realities. The realities that we are talking about here are goals of oppressed people, non-white populations within the borders of this country have historically constituted time within capitalism. And we have forgotten that all too often.

Many of us, for whatever reasons, whether questions of academic respectability or else seeking respectability from the so-called leftist movements of this country, have been all too willing to distort the individual concrete realities of our respective communities in order to fit ourselves into some larger idealistic whole.

So, I would like to leave you with those thoughts in mind. As you sit back and think about what was said up here today, I hope that you will consider their comments within the framework that I have tried to raise and that, I think, are important in trying to evaluate the topic.

## MINI-INTRODUCTION

## PANEL II

This session was designed to address and delineate the politics of Ethnic Studies and policy making in higher education; and in so doing, to place the development of these academic units in a larger context of the dialects of the university and U.S. society.

Participants in this panel session combined both a theoretical analysis of the role of Ethnic Studies in higher education to a broad range of policy proposals which included suggestions for a state review board of faculty and research development to the establishment of a statewide commission on higher education to provide guidelines for the development of Ethnic Studies programs.

## GILBERT GONZALEZ

Some of the issues around this problem have been touched upon earlier today in the talk by Professor Jorgensen and the remarks made by Dan Moreno. Now let's focus on some specifics.

Most of us--that is, Third World people, teachers on campuses--owe our jobs to the popular struggles of the recent past, the 1960's and 1970's and the Civil Rights struggles. These struggles were, in my opinion, struggles for democratic rights, fundamentally. The rights of minorities to enter the University and to have a curriculum based on the interests of Third World people and poor people. These struggles made certain demands, such as increased faculty, and most of us are here, as Third World people, because of these struggles themselves. The content of many of these programs was determined by these popular struggles; that is, how to create social change in the interests of the broad masses of people.

I think, in a very general way, that is the internal criteria of the Ethnic Studies programs. That is, they are dedicated to the creation of democratic popular changes in the interests of broad masses of people, especially Third World peoples. This is how I conceived of the Chicano Studies program at Cal State as a student and as an acting director in the late 1960's. How does the University serve the people, how does it bring itself down and get off its ivory tower and recognize that there are more things in the world than reading Don Quixote, emphasizing literature that deals with our people. So there is a general kind of criteria that is established which we operate within, within the programs themselves. However, we don't live in a vacuum; we live in a very real world that judges us by different kinds of criteria. That is the dilemma which Dr. Jorgensen touched upon this morning, that the University, the State Colleges and the junior colleges have particular criteria with which they judge the viability of programs, the viability of curriculua, and whether professors and teachers should be kept aboard or not.

So there we have a dilemma. We have a contradiction between our needs of what we think the programs should be and what kinds of directions they should go in, and the pressures that come from the university itself as to what is good and what is bad. Most of what we do, it goes without saying, is judged to be mediocre simply on the basis that it deals with issues that do not transcend time and are not universal. I am thinking of the English Department that deals with "transcendent" things and universal qualities. We don't deal with that--we are concerned with the here and now, we are very immediate, and we don't have a great backlog of publications, and so we are stuck with this external criteria torn from the university and impinging on that criteria that was established during the 1960's and what I think should be continued into the future. Therefore, I think the problem then becomes

"How does that initial force for recognizing and promoting social change in the interests of the people still continue into the future and still exist with this university?"

I would just like to offer some suggestions for possible discussion. I think that within the university, at the cost of a lot of struggle, a lot of sweat, and a lot of pain, the criteria established in the late 1960's can still be continued into the future. I think even though we may observe some of the university criteria--that is, for example, research and publications--I don't think that research by itself and publications by itself are necessarily out of focus with some of the internal needs--how do we get research and publication to correspond to the needs of the people? How do we get our research developed? How do we get it to promote change? And then, how do we force it upon the university, how do we force them to recognize it as being of value and meeting the criteria which has been established for all university professors. We're going to run into a lot of problems.

But I do feel that we should not look upon research or writing as something alien to Third World people. I think that this is something that we have to develop and that we have to make grow. It isn't something which falls out by simply being committed or by having political rhetoric; it comes from hard work, and no social change was ever created without a clear understanding of the objective situations that people live in. One of the things which our research can do is to clarify the nature of the society which we live in, the processes which are occurring, the manner in which politics and economics operate, so that those people who take our courses and those people who do read our research, and we ourselves who want to carry out social change, can more clearly then go about carrying out that task. But if we don't know the nature of the society we live in, if we don't know all the threads which keep people down, we're not going to be able to carry out any social change. So I think that at this particular time, research, writing and publications can have a role to play. It is not going to be the only role--it is only one step. The other step is to put it into action, and that takes a lot of planning. But that first step is, I think, the unraveling of thousands of threads that hold this society together, to understand this, in order to reshape it, reorganize it, so that the different kinds of indigent peoples are recognized.

## TOMAS ALMAGUER

I'd like to follow up on some of the points raised by Gil and continue in this same direction. I'll try to limit my discussion to three main areas: 1) a brief discussion of the development of Ethnic Studies as a result of a "historical compromise"; 2) begin to define some of the problems that Ethnic Studies has faced since its inception in the late 1960's; and 3) lastly, I want to propose some possible directions open to us today and suggest an agenda for people in Ethnic Studies.

Before we can talk about the problems of scholarship and tenure, or the more basic problem of program survival, we have to get a clear sense of the nature of Ethnic Studies in the university. One useful way of beginning to analyze the development of Ethnic Studies is to do so in terms of it being the result of a historical compromise, a compromise that brought Ethnic Studies into existence and one that is now threatening to slowly drive it out of the university. I am going to suggest that the contradictions and problems that we in Ethnic Studies face today are directly the result of the contradictory way in which we came into existence.

It was essentially the result of the conflict and uneasy compromise between vested corporate and political interests in this society and struggling racial minorities that Ethnic Studies programs were finally established. On the one hand, you had the political upsurge of Third World people who fought to open up the university and have it serve the needs of their respective communities. On the other, you had the development of an enlightened strategy on the part of local and state officials--with the aid of such corporate agencies as the Ford Foundation--which sought to appease Third World people and undercut the political thrust of their movements. The goal of this corporate strategy was to ultimately use these newly-founded Ethnic Studies programs to develop a "native elite" or new middle class among racial minorities and begin to use them as intermediaries between themselves and the rest of the Third World population.

In practice, this strategy allowed the development of Ethnic Studies programs, but in such a way as to insure that they would fit into pre-existing structures and meet corporate purposes. Ethnic Studies was not to become an alternative institution within the university; instead, it was to conform to the established guidelines laid out for traditional university departments. Ethnic Studies was designed to either help meet the general purpose of higher education in this society or to experience a short-lived existence.

In its most deceitful and insidious form, this strategy allowed some campus programs only a few years of actual life. Programs on these campuses were designed to make small concessions in times of political strife. By and large, the strategy to allow programs a few years of funding, then quietly drive them out of existence was the scenario played out on most campuses throughout the country. At this point, I would venture to guess that very few programs have been bought off outright and are now consciously working to further the corporate strategy of developing a new middle class. At the present, most Ethnic Studies programs still with us are going about the business of implementing the goals of the Third World struggles of the 1960's and are waging a struggle for departmental survival.

By continuing to work within the original purposes envisioned by the struggle of the late 1960's, Ethnic Studies has existed within a set of conflicting pressures. On the one hand, this has meant that we have had to survive in the face of a whole list of university demands. These have included the teaching of academically solid, nonpolitical courses; the pressure to engage in the type of research that is carried out in traditional departments; and the threat to produce "quality" research and publish it in the proper journals or perish. All this is set down in such a way that Ethnic Studies researchers are virtually forced into self-censorship if they want to survive academically. There is no incentive by the university for Third World scholars to publish for their own journals and to engage in the type of research that has clear ideological and political content that is at odds with the status quo.

Counterposed to these demands have been those which call upon Ethnic Studies faculty and departments to build the type of program which is geared to meet the needs of both a student and off-campus ethnic community. Work in this direction has included spending enormous amounts of time in curriculum development and faculty recruitment. Tied to this program development has been the need for Ethnic Studies faculty to develop the type of administrative skills needed to keep these programs afloat. Work in this direction has also included devising more democratic ways of governing our programs. Needless to say, this has not been an easy process. The active participation of students and staff in the daily operation of these programs has been valuable, but has not been without its problems.

Another crucial part of Ethnic Studies programs which has been at counterpoint to the main thrust of the university has been program efforts to serve our off-campus communities. The establishment of such programs as prison projects, health care projects, and work with legal aid organizations has been an important part of Ethnic Studies work in the community.

In carrying out these latter responsibilities, what has happened is that Ethnic Studies faculty have found that most of their time has been centered in three main areas: student affairs, administration of programs, and public service. One of the interesting things that comes out of the U.C. President's Task Force Report on Chicanos in Higher Education has been the documentation that most Chicano Studies faculty spend a tremendous amount of time in these areas. Let me give you an example.

According to the President's report, Chicano Studies faculty spend twice as much time doing administrative work as do the regular faculty at most universities. Faculty and staff in Chicano Studies spend three times as much time working with students on individual student projects and in student affairs. Probably the most revealing result of the President's Task Force Report has been the fact that Chicano Studies faculty spend ten times more time working in public service than do the faculty at large. For example, during a regular work week, only 2% of a university faculty member's time is spent working in public service types of endeavors, while Chicano Studies faculty spend nearly one quarter of their time, 23%, engaging in this type of activity. The result of this is now becoming clear. One need only look at the present situation of Chicano faculty throughout the U.C. system to get a picture of what we are up against. Let me give you a brief example of the situation on the Berkeley campus.

The President's Task Force reported that in 1973 there were 1305 ladder-rank faculty on that campus. That was in 1973. Of this ladder-rank faculty, only five were Chicanos. This year there are now six ladder-rank Chicano faculty at the Berkeley campus. Of these, we know only one who is tenured. This tenured appointment was essentially the result of a heated political struggle which took place in the early 1970's. Since that time--1972--there has not been another Chicano who has received a tenured appointment on the Berkeley campus. There are now four Chicano assistant professors on the Berkeley campus. All four of these have now reached the point, as a result of being on campus for five or six years, of having to face an uphill tenure review. We also have on our campus four Chicanos who are acting assistant professors. The case of the acting assistant professors is probably the most revealing. Of the four people, two are in Ethnic Studies and two are in traditional departments. Three of the four have had to ask for an extension of their two-year acting assistant professor appointment because of the heavy responsibilities they have had to carry in program committee work and in engaging in the type of community activity that is important to ethnic scholars. As a result, they have found it near impossible to complete their dissertations and are faced with the prospect of being terminated. One of the four Chicanos that was an acting assistant professor did manage to complete his dissertation. Unfortunately, he was in a traditional department, and as a result of the political nature of his dissertation and his work in the department, he was terminated.

So again, what I am trying to point out is that the situation is bleak. It has not improved since the late 1960's. What has happened is that we have essentially been caught in a crossfire between two forces: 1) the force of the university to make us meet requirements that will define our programs for us, and 2) the desire to keep Ethnic Studies true to visions laid out for us in the late 1960's.

Let me now talk about a couple of prospects for change; prospects that may not solve all the problems that Ethnic Studies is facing, but that will provide us with some partial solutions.

In talking about the future, it seems that we have to focus on three main areas. These include: 1) continuing to challenge "external" administrative constraints placed on us, 2) "internally" regrouping and critically assessing our present situation, and 3) developing "outreach" programs which build us allies and support for our struggle to survive.

In terms of the administration, we have to argue more strongly than ever for the acceptance of Ethnic Studies as a legitimate discipline and an important part of the university. We have to assert our right to exist. Similarly, we have to press the importance of our research and of our right to define the focus and orientation we bring to it.

Related to this struggle for legitimacy is the struggle over publication outlets. We have to continue to challenge the imposition of traditional department publication outlets for Ethnic Studies research. We have to push for the acceptance of Ethnic Studies journals as the legitimate outlet for Ethnic Studies research. In this regard, we have to continue to challenge the university seeing these journals as simply second-choice outlets; that is, as journals that we have to resort to because we cannot get our materials accepted in traditional publications.

At the same time, we have to also begin to escalate our challenge of traditional perspectives and interpretations found in mainstream journals. While we must continue to publish in our own Ethnic Studies journals, we must not lose sight of the importance of engaging in a critical dialogue with our mainstream academic counterparts. We have to sharpen our points of disagreement with them. In doing so, we develop a presence and take our ideological struggle to them.

One of the things that has happened in Chicano Studies, for example, is that we have spent an enormous amount of time reviewing the literature and compiling endless bibliographies. While we have begun to develop theoretical models, like internal colonialism, and have begun to experiment with methodological approaches like oral history, we have not moved beyond this point. We are still writing articles that begin with words like "toward" and "tentative". It is time that we move past these "first steps" approaches and begin to do work that talks of moving "beyond" traditional interpretations. We have reached the point where we have to begin to develop a type of critical interpretation of our experience that squarely confronts bourgeois social science. For many of us, this means taking our ideological struggle to such journals as the American Historical Review, the American Journal of Sociology, and the American Political Science Review.

Internally, we have to reaffirm the importance of developing this type of Ethnic Studies research. We have to see that the task of developing a critical body of knowledge and of engaging in ideological struggle with our mainstream counterparts is just as important as the community-based work our programs undertake. This is particularly true at elite institutions that are the centers for the production of research that serve corporate interests and generate social policy that works against the direct interest of Third World and working class people in general.

More practically, our internal reassessment should also entail us devising ways of easing our heavy administrative burdens. In part, this will mean developing a more equitable way of sharing program administrative responsibilities. It also means pressuring the university to hire tenured faculty who are better able to spend the time needed to do effective administrative work. At all costs, we have to avoid the suicidal trap of having nontenured people carry the administrative burden of Ethnic Studies programs.

Another way of developing internal strength is through the solidification of our own Ethnic Studies Associations. For Chicanos, this can be done through such organizations as the National Association of Chicano Social Scientists. They can serve the important function of providing a forum for the development of our research and providing the type of effective political machinery which is presently needed to collectively counter individual campus assaults on our programs. These organizations can act as political machines which lobby for more Third World student admission, for more faculty hiring, for securing promotion and tenure, and which press the overall struggle to gain legitimacy for Ethnic Studies research.

One final item in this agenda for Ethnic Studies is the need to develop an "outreach" program beyond our immediate student and community base. In this crisis period, we need to cultivate allies who will support our work in Ethnic Studies. This can come about through continuing to develop campus ties with progressive faculty and by developing association ties with such groups as the Union of Marxist Social Scientists and the Union of Radical Political Economists. We also have to begin to develop intellectual linkages with people who write in such leftist journals as Radical America, Socialist Revolution, the Insurgent Sociologist, the Review of Radical Political Economics, and such overseas journals as Economy and Society, New Left Review, and Critique of Anthropology. All of this will help us develop important political ties with that body of knowledge that we need today.

In conclusion, I want to add this one last thought. Today we have reached the time when we have to critically re-examine the nature of our work in the university. Now is the time for us to reflect on our successes and past mistakes. In doing so, we have to reassess just what our priorities are going to be. In all of this, we have to squarely face what is possible and what is not possible for us at the university. The time for self-deception and romanticism has long passed. In developing an effective strategy for the future growth of Ethnic Studies, we need to develop clarity and put aside our romantic purity. We have to learn from our brief history so that we do not repeat the same errors in the future.

## PETE CLECAK

After characterizing the present situation in Ethnic Studies as I see it, I want to offer a tentative proposal.

Three central factors characterize the situation. First of all, in the 1970's there has been a drop in anticipated funds that has affected all aspects of higher education; we are moving into a "steady state" situation in which change no longer will come about through large increases in total expenditures, but rather through internal reallocations and through gains in productivity in higher education. Second, since the early 1970's, there has been a sharp decline in student demand, and in citizen and community demand for Ethnic Studies. And third, the ignorance of most faculty and most administrators concerning the intrinsic value of Ethnic Studies persists.

As a consequence of all this, Ethnic Studies at the moment consists of only a tiny group of faculty and a small coterie of students--a very small coterie. I believe that strategies for survival have to be gauged in terms of these realities. Moreover, such strategies must differ according to the various educational contexts in California. That is to say, there should be distinct responses to the crisis of Ethnic Studies in the universities, in the state colleges, and in the community colleges. And these responses should correspond to the various functions of higher education: research, which is primarily carried on in the universities; teaching, which is primarily the concern of the state college system; and community service, which is primarily carried out at the community college level. I think we need to address these three areas in the subsequent discussion.

The urgent need now, it seems to me, is to claim existing funds and prevent a further erosion of internal institutional support. Second, I believe that in order to have a reasonable claim on these funds, we need to plan their use rationally. In an era of limits, this means statewide planning. Third, we need to enlarge student and public demand in a variety of ways--and on this point I probably differ with most of the participants here. I believe that Ethnic Studies cannot afford to confine itself to radical and Marxist paradigms; this is a sure path to isolation--intellectual isolation, isolation within the institutions of higher education, and isolation from students and various minority and majority communities. We need rather to encourage pluralistic approaches to Ethnic Studies (including Marxist approaches, of course), not simply in the interests of intellectual vitality and completeness, however important they may be, but in the interests of survival.

I should like to propose the establishment of a Citizens' Planning Commission on the Status of Ethnic Studies in California Higher Education. Composed primarily of minority people, this commission would be charged with assessing current spending in all sectors, and estimating the needs of Ethnic Studies over a ten-year period. It would begin to devise some realistic and coherent plans for a decade of development of Ethnic Studies in its several dimensions. The Commission would address the major questions: What ought Ethnic Studies do for individuals, groups, and for society? What percentage of funds ought to go to research? What percentage ought to go to teaching? What percentage ought to be devoted to community service? What percentage ought to be devoted to developing faculty to carry out these related functions? Faculty development is the key--and it costs time and money. Even if there weren't all the extra demands on minority faculty that interfere with research, it would take time. Once people see the intrinsic value of Ethnic Studies (in addition to its merely social value) and realize the right of people to have Ethnic Studies, it follows that the same kind of care and encouragement needs to be devoted to the development of faculty in this area as in any other domain of humanistic and social study. So there needs to be statewide planning to coordinate research and faculty development, teaching, and community service.

I think that if we were to survey the amount of money now spent on Ethnic Studies in California, we would find the total to be considerable. For example, if the state universities and colleges each spend $20,000 per year (including salary and other costs) to hire a lecturer in Chicano Studies, the total would come to about $400,000 per year. I don't know if they do--the actual figure may be higher or lower--but it illustrates my point. There probably are several million dollars floating around the state, now being spent less rationally than they might be. We therefore need some sort of planning agency that involves various constituencies, creates a public demand for Ethnic Studies, and proposes plans for the most effective use of funds within the various institutional settings of higher education--the university, the state colleges, and the community colleges. These institutions are not going to disappear, but Ethnic Studies might if such actions as the Planning Commission I propose are not taken.

Beverly
## ~~BARBARA~~ JACKSON

I would like to follow through on some of the things that Peter was saying in relationship to scholarship, publication and tenure. I see a definite need for these three areas. Scholarship--that is to say, to take the time to get the proper faculty that you need to instill the kind of scholarship that is really essential to the programs. Because money is a real factor, we have to be realistic about our budgets and be aware of what kinds of budgetary formats we have to follow; that sometimes you have to fall short and hire someone who may be a bit inferior, because you can't offer the amount of money needed for the "scholar".

Publication is very important. I feel you have to have an ideology; you have to have some kind of thought on which you can stand, not only of Ethnic Studies, but of society in general. To me it's a conflict--not because I don't think that publication is very important, but to get to the right publication is very important. Many universities stipulate that you have to publish by certain companies in order to obtain credibility. That's the kind of thing you have to be aware of. Many times in writing we have to deal with not only what Ethnic Studies is all about, but society in general--and when you deal with a publication, you have to take into consideration that many times if you are far left or far right, that they will not publish your ideas.

So what you are doing then is almost a double thing. We want to be able to have something to say that's relevant, but we also want to make sure we are publishing them in the right place. So one of the things I think we could do--and I think it is important to build up what I think we can do in the future--is to give credibility to some of our own publications.

With tenure you are looking at a cross. Everybody is judged in the same way. I'm not saying we should not be judged; definitely, that is important. We, as Ethnic Studies professors, definitely spend a lot more time dealing with other issues that many times other professors are not aware of or come into contact with. We're dealing more with the problems of culture, of dealing with students more on a one-to-one basis, or doing more outside things. I think that in addition to dealing with intellectualisms, and I think we can deal with those kinds of demands, we need to incorporate the socialization demands of our cultures. We have to come together. Some departments definitely do not look upon those kinds of demands as being important, and I think that we as administrators definitely have to push that kind of coming together before we are really going to accomplish anything.

Planning and strategy and organization definitely play a great role in the future of Ethnic Studies. You cannot plan just for today, you must plan for the future; and in addition to that, you have to have more than one strategy.

Again, ideology plays a very important role. Even this particular meeting, this coming together is important in that we are sharing ideas and commonalities. We have to have a base from which to start. The other disciplines have a hundred years of experience, and they went through a process of change, too.

I think we really need the time, but we have to make sure that we put that in the planning. Time is important, but what we're trying to stay away from is wasting time by saying "will we be getting to that point?" or "are we really developing something?", as Tomas said earlier. Right now is the time in which reevaluation and criticism are very important, and we have to establish some kind of written-down, long and short-term goals in which we say "What are we planning to accomplish?" Alternatives to those plans are important. And as we come together and share ideas and discuss these things, we can have a basis on which our ideologies can be strong enough that it would survive. Maybe later on we can touch on some of these areas.

## RONALD TAKAKI

Rudy Torres has just asked me if I would be willing to serve as a discussant, so I'm really not prepared to respond to these papers; however, upon listening to the papers, I'm glad I was asked to be a discussant. I don't think I agree with the views presented here today, and I would like to let you know how I think about the issues that have been raised. Then perhaps we can have a discussion, because I think there is too much concensus on this panel.

I think that the question we are asking here is "What is the relationship of Ethnic Studies to policy decisions in the areas of scholarship, publications and tenure?" Now, if we take the four panelists, essentially what they are trying to do is to ask two questions: What is the problem, and what do we do about the problem?

Now the problem as they defined it is "How do we as Ethnic Studies faculty secure tenure in a system that regards publication and research as essential prerequisites to tenure?" They tried to explain to you the unique situation and the unique pressures which are exerted upon Ethnic Studies faculty. Not only in terms of research, where we have to uncover new evidence and where we have to raise new questions and where we have to develop new theories of analysis, but also in terms of the pressures to teach. They let us know that if it were not for students, we would not be here. And we are a central part of that student movement, and we still feel an organic adherence to it. Also, our involvement in the community. We feel that if it were not for our involvement in the community and our service to the community, then our scholarship and our teaching will be empty and without meaning. And as Dr. Jorgensen pointed out, in order for us to develop an Ethnic Studies program, we as faculty have to participate in the building of that program. So we have these inordinate demands placed upon us as Ethnic Studies faculty. This is the problem, then, as it is defined by this panel. How do we then survive as faculty in this system, knowing that as we develop we come closer and closer to being reviewed?

Then, the second question is "What do we do about the problem?" And the panelists have offered some suggestions. Tomas says we should open it up, make it more democratic, involve students in the process. Others have suggested that we revise the criteria used for evaluation of professors for tenure. In other words, we regard publications and research as important, because they are important not because the university requires it, but because our community requires it. Also, we recognize the importance of teaching, the importance of university service, and then we recognize that many of us do not wish to publish in the American Historical Review, because that is not where our audience is. So we want to give legitimacy to our Ethnic Studies publications.

I think that we might want to redefine the problem, and a redefinition of the problem could lead to another conclusion as to what we do about the problem.

I think that the problem for us is not how to get tenure, but how to change the tenure review system. The problem as I see it is the tenure system itself. What I am suggesting is that we abolish the tenure system. The tenure system is like a guild, like the guilds were in the Middle Ages. It's a way for a closed group of people to determine who should enter the guild. And I'm wondering why we as Third World faculty want to get into that guild, when we do not believe in the validity of the guild to begin with. So that's the problem--the problem is the tenure system. Let's get rid of it. In the interim, of course, since this guild is going to resist us, we should have some ways to revise it or to open it up. The opening-up process is very important as a means to destroy the tenure system, because as we open it up, we begin to understand how this system works. That is, we begin to see that it is a very corrupt, a very evil system. And we begin to understand that it is impossible to win within that system. So opening it up should involve students; because as we involve students, and as they begin to understand what is involved in the process, they will begin to raise their consciousness and to understand that we should not try to work to get into it, but to work to overthrow it.

This applies, I think, to the Professor Harry Edwards case on the UC campus. Let students know how the system works, how it works within the departments, how ad hoc committees are formed, how the administration actually participates in the process, while publicly saying "We are separated from the process, we want the faculty to make the decisions". And how the Regents also participate in the system, and what the Regents represent. So I think we need what is called a sunshine, or a funnel-like strategy. Bring sunlight into it, open it up. Raise the level of political consciousness and understanding so that people can begin to understand that what we need is complete change, not reform.

Now in terms of Professor Clecak's comments about declining funding--the tenure system is part of the problem again. I don't think we have declining funding at the university; on the contrary, the budget of the University of California is increasing. The problem here is that so much of this funding is tied up with tenure. 80% of the Berkeley faculty is tenured. How do we change this system? How do we make the University of California more responsive to the needs of society? Yet most of the money is tied up with people who have jobs for life. You have one department whose existence is obsolete now, yet they are still there because they have so many tenured people, and you cannot eliminate that department, nor can you get rid of the faculty.

Take a case in point: Berkeley's Physics Department must have nearly eighty tenured professors who were brought in to serve in the Berkeley Lawrence Radiation Laboratory.

In order to attract these Nobel Prize winners, they were offered teaching appointments as well as research appointments. Look at what has happened to the Physics Department. Enrollments have dropped considerably. But still you cannot move those FTE's out of Physics and into Ethnic Studies, because they are tied up as tenured professors. These slots are solid. So from an administrator's perspective, where you have social and political pressures being exerted on an administrator, like a chancellor or a vice chancellor of academic affairs, his hands are tied, because most of those FTE's are tied down. So why is it that Ethnic Studies has not expanded, and why is it that innovative programs are not responding to social problems like pollution, urbanization, poverty, oppression of Third World people? There are no resources to use. The resources are there, you just can't move them around. Why is it that we cannot move them around? To a large extent, it is because of the tenure system.

So it seems to me that rather than try to reform it, rather than try to get into this guild, we have to try to eliminate it, to work for the elimination of the guild. This doesn't mean that I disagree with the panelists in terms of what to do on a practical basis. I am just saying that it is important to know what we are working towards. And if what we are working towards is admission into the guild, then I don't want to work with it. If what we are working towards is the abolition of the guild, then I will say yes, I will work with them.

# DISCUSSION

RUDY TORRES: I would like to ask the panelists if they would like to make a very brief comment before we entertain questions.

GILBERT GONZALEZ: Ron raises a number of very important points that I think we should have covered; that is, that the tenure system itself is practically useless, it is like an appendage of the past which does not serve any more useful function. However, between now and the time that it is eliminated probably will match the time between now and the elimination of the university as it exists today. I have talked about this problem of tenure with some professors, professors who are not minority people, and they are also discussing it among themselves and their colleagues. Nobody likes it, and yet nobody wants to touch it.

The problem is then, he says, what should we do about it? How should we then base the criteria for keeping people on? That then becomes a problem with the departments themselves. We have to resolve that problem--what is a good teacher? What are the criteria? And that is something that I forgot to mention and which has brought up a lot of problems in Ethnic Studies programs--oftentimes, criteria becomes ideological, and it breaks down. I would like to address myself to that point; that is to say, we should gauge ourselves for a long struggle for the future, and for which we need all the allies possible, all the people who at least can come together and agree upon some common minimal demands. I think that the important thing is to survive; and one of the ways in which we can survive is by getting some kind of commonality of purpose among members of faculty. That is, survival of the program is the most important thing; we get some kind of common political purpose, practical purpose, so that we can carry out that program. I think that is what is more important now. In the future I would like to see the destruction of the tenure system, but still we are faced with what is the internal criteria. And a lot of the problems we face in Chicano Studies is that there is a tendency to engage in polemics and to create ideological divisions which are not basic. The struggle now is the survival of the program and figuring out how to do that. That's one problem!

The other problem is the criteria itself. That puts the criteria on our shoulders, internally in the department, as to who deserves to get tenure. How does it go then? Who deserves to keep their job? Does everybody deserve to keep their job? That's another problem, one that can be discussed right now. That is, right now we are facing a common enemy, they are coming down on the programs, and all the popular forces which can be martialed, and all the allies, should be brought together for a common effort rather than having ideological disputes be placed in the forefront. That happens sometimes. So I think that the practical problem that faces us now is survival. And within that practical problem, the criteria will still remain for good people in research, will still remain for publications that serve the interests of the democratic aspirations of the people.

PETE CLECAK: I would like to say a few things about Ron's discussion, which was an interesting one. On the matter of funding--I suggested, or meant to suggest, several things. One, there are more Ethnic Studies funds in California now than we think. But they are not rationally allocated, in my opinion. Secondly, there are less funds for higher education than we had grown accustomed to expect in the post-war period. In the late 1960's, the idea was to resolve conflicts by throwing in a little bit or a lot of money at them. Now that time is past, and we shall need to do more with less resources than we had hoped to have. And this brings me to your proposal about abolishing tenure. This certainly would free up a lot of money, but it might free up a lot of Ethnic Studies programs too. I don't think the choice is between the present tenure system or no tenure system at all, but rather between the present system and some sort of limited tenure system. In such schemes, you don't appoint someone and, after seven years, give that person lifetime security as a professor. Such investments, which capitalize out at something like a million dollars, tie up huge amounts of money. Moreover, you don't make that kind of lifetime appointment with a confident expectation that this person is going to be motivated to be productive until he or she is 65. Lots of folks quit prematurely. They keep collecting their salary, they keep showing up on campus; but for all practical purposes, they're dead by the time they are 40, 45, or 50. It may be that we will want to discuss further the idea of limited tenure, say a five-year period, with the possibility of renewal--and the possibility of non-renewal. This would free up a lot of money in the university. However, we would then be faced with the problem of a political struggle for various shares of that money. If even a limited tenure system were adopted, where would Ethnic Studies be vis-a-vis political and pedagogical demands on the part of various constituencies within the public, students and faculty? Considering the current status of Ethnic Studies, I think the question answers itself.

AUDIENCE: This is a series of questions directed to Ron Takaki. First, how do you go about tearing down the walls? Since you talked about it, I'm sure you have some ideas about it. Second, how do you enlist the warriors to help you carry on this war, because this tenure system seems to me like a well-entrenched institution very deep within the educational system. And third, how do you turn educators around and trustees around to rethink a lot of things? I guess what I'm thinking about as I'm talking is walking around USC and looking at the Department of Slavic Studies and the department of this studies and the department of that studies and wondering what kind of relevance they could have to anybody. Who makes the decision to fund these particular departments--is it the graduates of the school, is it the different deans, the professors, the board of trustees?

RON TAKAKI: I think that's the next question to ask. If we do want to tear down the tenure system, the question is "How do we do it?" Peter Clecak has suggested one way to do it, and that is to create another system called "limited tenure". But actually, there is no such thing as limited tenure--tenure is tenure; in other words, an appointment with security. It is something else to talk about a five-year contract. The question we have to ask, I think, is the first one: What is the purpose of tenure? Originally, the purpose of tenure was to protect academic freedom. Now we have to ask our colleagues, especially our tenured ones, whether or not tenure is indeed serving this purpose. And I don't think that it is serving this purpose. What has happened is that tenure is serving another purpose, that of protecting your vested interests. Let's ask another question then: since academic freedom is, one could say, something which is desirable, how do you secure it? Apart from the tenure system, that is. I think you can secure it, say through the building of a strong faculty union. Not just a faculty union, but a union of university employees which would include our staff, which would include our janitors--so that if academic freedom is indeed threatened, we can shut down this place, we could turn the lights off. I mean, that's the way to protect academic freedom, not through some tenure system, which is being used for another purpose. That's part of the process of tearing it down. The question is then, where will we secure the support?

I think there are a number of potential allies, and some of them are allies who have different reasons for opposing tenure. There are some administrators who would like to get rid of some Ethnic Studies faculty. But I think also you do have administrators who think that the tenure system is not flexible enough for them to operate, and for them to make their institutions more responseive, not only to the needs of society, but for educational needs. How do you create the flexibility required to turn on students? The whole departmental concept, I think, is obsolete today. Many administrators would like to see more interdepartmental studies developed. But how can we do this? All FTE's are tied into departments, you know.

So I think that from the administrative point of view there is a potential for coalition. Politicians also feel that tenure is tying down the university. I think Jerry Brown, for example, is raising some questions about the university. In a recent meeting of the Regents, he said that the University is partly responsible for the problems of society in the way that it is training our students and in the values that it is transmitting to our students. And I know that people in the State Assembly would like to make the University of California more flexible, more responsive. And then there are also groups in society which would also, I think, like to join into a coalition to open up the system and to destroy tenure. I think that the potential is there, and I think that it is really important that we in Ethnic Studies play a leading role in the criticism of the tenure system.

Unless we abolish tenure--Peter talked about the fact that if we abolish tenure there is going to be a lot of jockeying, and you have to ask yourself whether or not you would be in a position to do well in this jockeying--the problem that I see now is that there is no jockeying taking place. In other words, we are not part of that system to jockey. And so I don't think we have any alternative here but to move in a new structural direction, i.e., eliminate tenure; and I have suggested some ways in which we can move in this direction. One, think in terms of five-year contracts, think in terms of unionizing, think in terms of working with certain groups. They may not have the same interests as ours, but we can nevertheless form what Antonio Gramsci calls a "historical bloc", where different groups come together at a certain moment, where there is danger involved in operating within this historical bloc. Just so long as we are aware of what the danger is, at least we can participate within that process of the historical bloc, knowing that what ultimately we want is very different from what ultimately the administration wants.

JOSEPH JORGENSEN: I have a comment rather than a question, but it is more or less to answer a question that was asked; that is, how are university programs created, and what is the University? There are a lot of angles you can pursue, but a university is really a place for free and open inquiry, and it becomes compounded by lots of other themes. When the Ford Foundation and the Rockefeller Foundation and the CIA and other institutions in our Federal Government and institutions in the private sector decided to protect us from the threats from around the world, we got Slavic Studies programs.

Well, that goes for all area studies, and that's exactly how most Ethnic Studies programs got created. Tomas is absolutely correct. The Ford Foundation started channeling money into Ethnic Studies so that they could create a middle class that would, in fact, diffuse the problems that were developing throughout the United States. It wasn't a university issue at all, it was an issue much beyond it. So the university becomes a place that is very much political, as well as a place for free and open inquiry. So however the university gets back to the position where it's for free and open inquiry of the kind that we want to do, of the kind that happens to be legitimate--and I say the inquiry being done in America in Ethnic Studies and Third World studies that is legitimate isn't in our curriculum--we're not here to create another middle class, although most of the theory that passes for American aculturation and assimilation calls for the creation of a new middle class; for elevating brown and black people into a bourgeousie.

So what I want to say is that tenure, yes, it has its faults, because it has become lifelong job security, not a place to preserve free and open inquiry. Free and open inquiry should mean a Marxist dialectic, as well as somebody who wants to do path analysis, as trivial as I think path analysis is. So that it should be a place for that; it should be a place for us to pursue the kinds of studies that are specifically left out of all the textbooks, the learned books in the nation, and give us a chance, give America a chance, give the world a chance to know what the forces are that manipulate and form the controls, and how, if you want to carry on an argument outside of these forces, how it can then be done.

Finally, how about these major issues that Ron was raising about pollution and the despoiling of the environment, about the expropriation of resources. The university, you say, is not a place for that, although that kind of research can be done with private contractors--that's another contradiction, because they are deeply involved in it, and much of their decision-making is expressly pushed towards solving these policy questions. And so it is at this point where the university, and Pete Clecak is absolutely right, that's where you have to challenge them. You have to flush out, find out what the policy decisions are, what kind of money is available, how it should be allocated, and how it perhaps should be allocated on the levels of research, teaching and community service.

STANLEY ARONOWITZ: I would like to make two short comments and then ask one question. Some of you may know that I'm an old trade union organizer; and as far as I can tell, unionization of employees has always meant a form of life-long tenure, and if anybody ever tried to fire a worker in a shop that I was representing I'd have him taken out with a noose around his neck and I'd have to string him up.

Which raised the next question, which is Gramsci's concept of the "historical bloc". He talked about craft alliances as the most progressive groups; of the administrations of the large universities, the University of California in particular, as progressive groups in the struggle for progress. That's just a comment. They are not rhetorical questions; I thought maybe you could field them.

Now another question around the problem of legitimacy, which was provoked by your question about Slavic Studies. I agree with what Joe says about the art, but area studies are organized around the principle that the traditional academic boundaries in literature, English literature programs, historically were insufficient to deal with certain areas of literature. That is to say, that the ideological level then was justified on the basis of literary, not social science, but literary efforts. The problem then became one of legitimacy, and they in fact gained it because the English people were not interested. So you had Germans, Slavics and a whole group of others who still did the social sciences, but they always had the literary orientation. Ethnic Studies, at least to me, has a social science orientation principally, with some people interested in literature as well. And there the social sciences have comparative social science perspectives; comparative political, comparative sociological, comparative anthropological, etc. The question I would like to ask the panel is whether anybody has thought of a politics of legitimacy with a social science orientation, as against the literary orientation of traditional Ethnic Studies programs.

PETE CLECAK: I can't respond to Stanley's second question, but as to the first question about the historical bloc--it seemed an interesting idea, and a basic one that we have to get down to. That is, it seems to me that the two arrangements, namely the tenure system and unions, taken together help the American professoriate to be among the most conservative forces in society vis-a-vis social and educational change. This is true of people who are ideologically at odds with their own self interests, as well as people who aren't. I think that's just a fact that we have to face, that the professoriate is conservative in the sense of wanting to pursue its own self interests.

The tenure system and unions both do this. I think that a limited tenure system, which is a concept in the language, by the way, would be a step in the right direction. I also think that, to a certain extent, administrations and administrators reflect the interests of faculty; but also there is a tradition among some administrators that makes them at least progressive on the matter of educational change, or potentially progressive. Further, if there was a possibility for progressive action within the educational sphere, that is to make higher education more interesting and relevant to students, I think there are people who are ready to move on this. I think there are people who would be willing to move into administration if they had the chance through a partial freeing up of funds and positions. I think you would find that some administrators are a substantial force among administrators who would constitute a progressive force vis-a-vis educational needs.

AUDIENCE: I would like to make some comments on what has been said during the past couple hours and sort of make a summation of all of it, and to mention some things that I have been thinking about. One of them is that the way tenure has been spoken about here, and particularly Ron Takaki's sensible critique of the system, is to treat tenure as a structural problem, and I don't agree--I think that tenure, in fact, is a process issue. Tenure is the process by which faculty are able to maintain--especially university faculty--a place in a privileged class in society. I am not speaking as a sociologist or a psychologist, but I know that a lot of research has been done on job satisfaction, including studies on university employees; and studies show that university faculty have the highest job satisfaction of anybody in the entire culture, period. So you're talking about the kind of thing that not only involves money, but a lot more. So I think that it is important to look at tenure as a process, and then I agree that not only can you make critiques of tenure as craft union, but the critique can then go on to include all aspects of the university, including all classes of people who work here, and so on and so forth.

On the other hand, what is structural is the state. I agree that all educational institutions, but in particular state universities, are in fact appendages of the state. That's what the structure is all about. This is where I would like to comment on Professor Jorgensen's point of view; he said a number of things that I think are very true, and I think his fundamental point of view is correct. But I think one point is missing, and that is that the university has never been a place of free and open inquiry. The universities were highly authoritarian structures, and every step toward liberalization of the universities was by increased and open class struggle, from the Middle Ages up to the present time. It was affected by everything from unionization and childhood labor and the whole works. So that kind of idealism may not be a serious mistake alone, but I think that it does become a mistake in the whole, because it causes you to lose sight overall of the true political nature of education as a whole, and I would say the absolute political nature of education, if I might be so bold.

References were made to Gramsci's historical bloc. Gramsci also said that to live is to take sides. Now that may not sound very important, but what I'm getting at is that one of the most important things is--and this is not to take away from anything that anybody else has said about tactics and union struggles--one of the most important things to do is to in fact carry out the ideological struggle and a systematic critique of capitalism within the university. To me, that's the proposition, and that's more important than any structural, or any temporary structural issue. The reason for that is that the ruling class is leading everybody through the gate. If you look at Bill Moyers, who is a member of the Rockefeller Commission on Higher Education, is a member of the Trilateral Commission, he is partly responsible for putting out the new line in the Rockefeller Commission and the Carnegie Commission, and that is that Ethnic Studies is no longer to be the Ethnic Studies of colored peoples. Ethnic Studies, from the social science paradigm, is now Ethnic Studies of the Italians, the Irish, and almost everybody else. They are trying a co-oping move with the whole of Ethnic Studies in the universities, and the only counter co-op move to what they are doing is to address the class and move straight up. Even though Bill Moyers has made a more scathing critique of capitalism than I have heard in this room yet or on television. And again, I say "Why?" It is because world forces are polarizing the struggle between the issues of the working people on one hand and the ruling class on the other hand.

# MINI-INTRODUCTION

## PANEL III

The discussion centered and generated the following themes and questions: What is the relationship between the Political Economy of Higher Education and the development of Ethnic Studies; the dialectics of class and race relations in higher education; Ethnic Studies as class struggle; higher education and the labor market and Marxism/ Cultural nationalism and the Third World Student.

## MAJADI IMARA

There are several important approaches to such a complex topic as race, class and higher education. These themes have multiple definitions, concepts and interests. Because of this complexity, I believe a general historical framework should be discussed, as well as the more specific issues of the present symposium. Following this discussion, I hope the panelists will respond to the issues I have raised regarding the nature of race, class and higher education.

The proposition that Third World People, and Black people particularly, have historically contributed to the birth and growth of "western" civilization is generally accepted amongst true scholars and intellectuals in the academy of education. Those who reject such a proposition are neither of the above.

Perhaps it is ironic that one Euro-American scholar was bold in pointing out one important aspect of the historical record. John Weatherwax, in his book Ancient Africa, asserted that the first racial types were the "Africoid" as opposed to "Negroid." Later, how much later is not certain, "Asiatic" racial types appeared in Asia. The colored races came first; the "Caucasoid" or white racial types were a later development through a process of "natural selection" over very long periods of time.

Weatherwax continues with the assertion that it is quite generally accepted that Greece and Rome were among the main fountains of "Western" culture. As for Rome, another aspect of the historical record shows that Romans were of all races. As for Greece, the historical record shows that it achieved its greatness primarily as a result of contact with "Eastern" and African cultures.

To substantiate this, George James, a distinguised Afro-American scholar, pointed to the proposition that the Greeks were not the authors of "Greek Philosophy," but the Black people of North Africa, commonly called the Egyptians. James supported this proposition in his well-detailed and documented book Stolen Legacy.

James argues that this theft of the African legacy by the Greeks led to erroneous world opinion that the African continent had made no contribution to civilization other than that of Black labor.

In spite of the fact that the process of white racism was set in motion prior to the Greeks, it is this particular misrepresentation that has become the mass philosophical basis of white racism in the ancient world. It is in the ancient world where the seeds of racism originate and grow. Sources supporting this general assertion include G.P. Malalaskera and K.N. Jayatillleke, Buddhism and the Race Question; Chiekh Anta Diop, African Origin of Civilization; and Chancellor Williams, Destruction of Black Civilization: Great Issues of a Race from 4500 B.C. to 2000 A.D.

I will be the first to admit to the far-reaching implications and consequences of the problem when viewed from this seemingly new conceptualization and perspective on race and class relations. One should also realize that new insights must be brought to the study of race and class relations if we are to truly approach and affect the structure and function of race and class relations in higher education.

Understanding the theft of the African legacy is going to mean a tremendous change in world opinion and attitude for all people--a realization and consciousness of their cooperation with each other in building this world and maintaining it. It will serve as a challenge to progressive scholars.

In combining their efforts, the races must teach and preach the truth that the "Mystery System" or Educational system of the African continent is the light of the world, the source of philosophy, religion, the arts and the sciences. The races must see to it that all false praise of the Greeks be removed from the textbooks of our schools and colleges--for this is one process that has aided tremendously in ignorance and the racial-class status quo in the United States and its institutions of higher edication.

We must adopt an attitude of protest against forms of missionary enterprise which maintain a policy of colonialism and neo-colonialism against Black people and other Third World people. We must maintain this attitude until Black people, or people in general, are liberated from the chain of traditional falsehood.

What is the political economy of Ethnic Studies? What is the relationship of the political economy of Ethnic Studies to broader race and class issues? Before approaching these specific questions, it is essential for us to ascertain the subject matter of the concepts of race, class, and higher education, Ethnic Studies and political economy.

Let us begin our discussion by defining the concept class. Three notable groups in the literature have adopted class concepts to explain the positions and relationships of people, particularly Third World nations and ethnic groups, two of which are Eurocentric in scope. The first is influential among the Aristotlean, the conservative and even liberal sociological traditions. The second is largely represented by the thoughts, writings and philosophies of Marx, Engels, and Lenin. The third group is Third World, represented by Third World cultural traditions as well as the contemporary thoughts, writings and philosophies of Mao, Guevara, Zapata, Nkrumah, Malcolm X *et al*.

In The Political Economy of Racism, two liberal authors, Franklin and Resnik, observe that almost every analyst dealing with the condition of Third World people uses the class concept in some way. Generally, Franklin and Resnik explain the class concept as they see it historically being used in this country. They point out

> "...that as the emphasis on class increases, the emphasis on race decreases, and vice-versa. Where the emphasis on race predominates, as among the race analysts, the emphasis on class as a primary determinant diminishes. When race advocates use the concept of class, usually defined in terms of

> income level, it is seen primarily as a result of racism.
>
> Discounting the race factor is the blindness of a straight Marxist class approach. Marxist analysis posits the working class as a key component of revolution, yet it fails to take into account the obvious existence of racism within both the labor rank and file and the labor unions. Marxists have placed emphasis on class at the expense of race. This lack of interest lies in the Communist policies resulting in their inconsistent positions on self-determination, the Black Belt and Black nationalism."

The problem that plagues this analysis is that Franklin and Resnik do not take into consideration the origin of race and class in the ancient world as a process continuing in various forms today. Nor do they really "get down" to developing the positions and relations of the Third World people. What this analysis does supply is an interesting historical relationship between the integration of Marxism into the discussion of Black liberation and the defense of this discussion by neo-Marxists, liberals and integrationists.

Insofar as Afro-Americans are concerned, the problem is racial, and any analysis that fails to deal thoroughly with the racial problem is condemned to irrelevance. Albert Memmi's *Dominated Man* attempted to reduce racism or the racial problem and the main types of oppression and group conflicts to their commonalities, thereby typing Blacks to a general category. Even the Black sociologist, Oliver Cromwell Cox, in his popular *Caste, Class and Race*, viewed racism as a result of the universal problem of class or capitalist oppression. These two works are poor studies because they deny or ignore the historical uniqueness of the Black situation and experience. For Blacks, the universalistic theme, in this sense, obscures African heritage and the future conditions of Black people, rather than clearly explaining African heritage and the future conditions of Black people. Studies which illuminate the latter concern include George James, Stolen Legacy, Yosef ben Jochannan, Black Man of the Nile, Chancellor Williams, Destruction of Black Civilization, Cheikh Anta Diop, The African Origin of Civilization, W.E.B. Dubois, The World and Africa, Kwame Nkrumah, Consciencism, Neo-Colonialism, and Class Struggle in Africa, Walter Rodney, How Europe Underdeveloped Africa, etc.

In this country, Black people are oppressed because they are Black, and as a consequence of this oppression other oppressive factors take shape. Black people are oppressed by a system unified on the basis of white racism. Again, white racism is a concept that speaks to the total system, the mass philosophy of the social order, which purposely excludes Blacks or reduces Black development. For Blacks in the U.S. the more appropriate theoretical description of Black people's overall social position is racism. The social order is perceived by Third World people (Blacks, Asians, Chicanos, Native Americans et al) on the basis of their experiences.

A class analysis helps to broaden our understanding of the role that the economic, educational and political systems play in this society. To reduce racism to the general class struggle in this country, is absurd and naive. To ignore the class struggle, however, is foolhardy. In Hubert Harrison's book, When Africa Awakes, it is pointed out that a few individuals may indulge in the luxury of ignoring race and posing as utterly raceless humanitarians. He also asserts that race feeling is not so much a result of social evolution as it is of biological evolution.

Now that we have touched on the race and class concepts, let us describe higher education as the general category which serves a function, formally or institutionally, of either maintaining or radically reforming the existence of a society. Higher education is largely responsible for training or educating people to behave and develop within a social structure of a given ethnic or cultural group.

Ethnic Studies in higher education in the United States has been defined by many, usually depending upon the ethnic group and their particular concern. If we are concerned about Ethnic Studies as an historical movement in this country, then Lawrence Crouchett, in "The Development of the Sentiment for Ethnic Studies," offers a useful definition. He defines Ethnic Studies as a two-sided phenomenon. On one hand, Ethnic Studies stresses the process of preserving cultural heritages through the processes of bilingual/biculturalism and ethnic subjects. On the other hand, it includes the study of how these cultures are transformed, extinguished, assimilated and acculturated into mainstream society. Crouchett views Ethnic Studies not as a recent phenomenon peculiar to present cultural groups, but as a phenomenon dating back three hundred years when many present day white ethnic groups, in addition to Blacks, held the status of "minority." The term "Ethnic Studies," however, was not coined until the 1960's.

Another definition of Ethnic Studies is held by James Banks in his article, "Ethnic Studies as a Process of Curriculum Reform." He defines Ethnic Studies as a process of curriculum reform and change, whereupon the focus moves from a totally Eurocectric perspective of the curriculum content (at whatever the level) to a fragmented additive model (used to coopt demands for ethnic literacy and relevancy in the curriculum relative to community development), but still viewed from a Eurocentric perspective; to a cultural ethnic perspective, where the focus is "equally" distributed among ethnic nations. The point here is that all groups are ethnic groups and no one ethnic group should dominate the curriculum.

Both Crouchett's and Bank's definitions are inclusive of the society, and both point to the needy foundation of Ethnic Studies in the U.S. as well as its future.

Political Economy has been defined as a class, a party science by Leontiev in his Political Economy. Leontiev states that the only genuine scientific political economy is that of the working class, created by Marx, Engels, and Lenin, and the collective thought of the International Com munist Movement. I define political economy as simply the production, distribution and control of land-food-shelter-clothes-health-education and the security of a people, or of humanity.

Thus, the political economy of Ethnic Studies and higher education serves as an analytical and practical function of relationships of ethnic groups. It should prepare the members of ethnic groups to meet their material needs, to live better, and to produce activities which build an inclusive future for their children.

I would like, therefore, to conclude by asking our panelists to discuss these statements in view of their analysis of the political economy of Ethnic Studies in relationship to broader race and class issues. I would like them to also consider whether or not a political economy of Ethnic Studies would subordinate Ethnic Studies to Marxist Studies, or to something else?

## STANLEY ARONOWITZ

I would like to begin by examining the relationship between race and class generally, then to propose a relatively simple tool for understanding how it affects functions. We might then examine how this system of higher education has related to the questions of race and class within the general function of what colleges and universities do in America.

In the first place, I think, again paraphrasing the previous speaker, that it would be an enormous mistake not to take the question of class and race from both an economic as well as the cultural perspective. I think there is no doubt that while class forces historically have been powerful in contributing to the shaping of the American political economy, i.e., American culture and politics, that the racial questions--the question of the relationship between race and society--is prior to the development of capitalism. But what capitalism does do is to provide the specific configuration on which that relationship is understood in a given historical period. So that without an understanding of capitalism in the U.S. and how it develops historically, one mystifies the relationship between race and class. To put it another way; what are we talking about has to be understood in a very specific way: relatively autonomous streams of development which have never been completely separate from one another in the history of capitalism because of the inheritance of racial stigma. The role of stigma in the development of capitalism--as applied to racial minorities and women and ethnic minorities in certain periods who were not Black, not Chicano, not Puerto Rican, and who were not from Third World countries--have been employed in very specific ways.

Let me be very concrete. There is a very peculiar mystification which goes on in American history about the way in which America developed. That peculiar mystification is to attribute the oppression of Black people after the Civil War (not withstanding the promise of the Civil War which was to make Black people free--the ideology of the Civil War having almost nothing to do with the reason it was actually fought) to white racism as an undifferentiated category. I am prepared to say, yes, it was due in part to white racism and there is no question about that.

Allow me to illustrate the point. If you take the position of history, the betrayal of reconstruction, as W.E.B. Dubois described it brilliantly in Black Reconstruction has an awful lot to do with the internationalization of capital, the specific position of the U.S. within the international division of labor. From 1800 to 1890 the role the U.S. played in terms of the international problems of economic development was to provide cotton and tobacco to the world. The balance of payments and the balance of trades problems had to do principally with the strength of the agricultural South. The Black worker was a slave or allegedly free, or a sharecropper or a share-tenant. The Black worker was the heart of the strength of American capitalism and the imprisonment of the

Blacks within the South was a condition for the primitive accumulation of capital, a condition for the capacity of the U.S. to undertake industrialization. Though not the only condition, it was the major condition. It is in consideration of that particular form of accumulation--that is, on the backs of Black workers--that American capital achieved its initial spur or what Walt Rostow, a prominant bourgeois economist, would call the take-off point. This insured that the further expansion of the U.S. would not be on the basis of free Black labor but that further expansion and manufacturing would take place on the basis of the recruitment of another peasant class, namely the southern and eastern Europeans who were in a roughly analagous position to Blacks in the U.S. (I am not talking about the social relations of slavery, I am rather referring to the fact that they were locked into an agrarian system, the difference being that it was an agrarian system in Sicily and eastern Europe which was no longer viable but respective of the capitalist development of those countries).

So Eastern European peasants became the basis for the manufacturing labor within the U.S. which played an enormously important role in terms of the splits within the working class and the ability of racist ideology to find an objective root within the development of the American capitalist system. That is to say there were differential allocations of the division of labor between economic developments of racist ideology that come into play such that Black people then become excluded when the material conditions for their suppression in the South are no longer objectively necessary. They were recruited historically, for the first time in northern labor in 1907 when they were used as "scabs" in a major steel strike and before that in the coal strike of 1902. In the Homestead Strike there is a scatter of Black labor used as "scabs." (For those who are the uninitiated, a "scab" is someone who works against the interest of workers who are out on strike or who are in the process of a boycott). Black labor finally achieves a certain toe-hold in major American northern and southern industry in 1917 and in the packing houses and the steel industry particularly, again with a certain ambivalence. That is, after the war they are thrown out of the packing houses, many of them return south because they are laid off and in the steel industry it takes them another war, the Second World War, to get themselves back in. What I am suggesting is to take the question of priority historically between race and class, is not a useful way of looking at it. If you take capitalism as a world system and capitalism as a dominant system within the U.S., especially in the process of concepts of race, the concept of class and ethnicity doesn't make sense. Without the concept of class, the notion of race and ethnicity becomes one-dimensional, becomes abstracted and, therefore, becomes false in the history of the system. That is the first thing I want to say.

It is out of this dialectic that there develops a whole set of conditions for the emergence of the working class in this society which maintains the dialectic between ideology and subordination. The system that develops is a system of dual labor markets which has been worked through by a number of people--David Gordon of the New School among them in another context which I am trying to adapt to the present discussion.

Let me tell you what I think the concept of the dual labor market means and what its significance is. It is a historical concept which describes the fact that within the U.S. the working class is structurally divided. The working class is divided according to a system of social production in which there is again a division of labor between the monopoly and state sectors on one hand and the consumer goods manufacturing and the service sectors on the other. If one doesn't understand that labor maket, it is impossible to understand, in my opinion, what the function of higher education is and what the history of the development of Ethnic Studies has been. That labor market begins to function I think, principally after the First World War and reaches its maturity after the Second World War. What happens then is that the life chances of people are determined in the economic sense by a structured niche within the system. There is absolutely no evidence that for the southern and eastern Europeans on one hand, and for the Black, Chicanos, and Puerto Ricans on the other hand, that there is any substantial movement except during wartime from one labor market--the competitive consumer goods labor market--to the other. That is to say, in the monopoly and the state sectors in areas of administration--in the most skilled jobs and even unskilled jobs--we have a structure of wage determination in which there is double the wages of those in the consumer goods and the retail sector. The niches that are assigned to varieties of racial and ethnic groups corresponds to the development of those labor markets. There is, of course, some spill-over.

Now let's talk briefly what happens to higher education. Higher education has the function of performing two essential functions. First, it produces both ideological and technical knowledge for the reproduction of the social system, and secondly, it trains people within the framework of those non-structures which we call methodologies and paradigms. To function within that system, there is a functional definition of higher education. When you have periods of economic expansion, higher education as well as secondary education are forced to expand because Blacks, Chicanos, Puerto Ricans, and women constitute the reserve army of the technical world whole new groups must be brought into that process in these circumstances. Secondly, this expansion is necessitated by the recognition on the part of these groups that they have a right to that process: they begin to make demands and there are mass movements seeking for entrance, to access to that process. I was witness to the development of the open admissions policy in New York City. I must tell you it was on the drawing board from the Administration during the Vietnam War. But that was only the necessary condition. The sufficient condition for open admissions was the sit down of thousands of Puerto Ricans and hundreds of Black students in the schools. There was no chance on God's green earth that racist ideology was going to open the door without that kind of struggle. So these are the two conditions. The third one, obviously, is the need to train the middle class that we heard presented at this morning's panel, which was a very powerful factor.

The point that I am trying to make is that if you take the analysis of the overall economic life of this country in the 70's and its tendency toward stagnation and decline owing to a series of international conditions and domestic conditions which I am limited by time from discussing now, there is no longer a need for expansion. There is no longer a need for recruitment of certain groups of racial minorities into sections of the labor market from which they have been historically been excluded. In fact, there is a need now for a reverse process to take place. There is no necessity for the recruitment of managerial, technical, as well as knowledge producing groups and, therefore, the fundamental rationality is not venality on the part of the administration. (Jerry Brown is as bad as any other governor, no worse). Hence, there is no need to expand the system of higher education.

Well, there is a lot more, but I would stop there and argue then that what is critical is not to polarize around race and class but see these within a unified system of international capitalism. And secondly, it is important to understand that without a political movement outside the university--that is, a movement in the community that demands not just access to the university but begins to address the whole priority system of social welfare, it is virtually impossible to move seriously toward the strategy of saving Ethnic Studies.

R.

## ~~O~~. KARENGA

I have entitled my talk "Validity of Ethnic Studies Using Class and Race as a Totality." I will start from the assumption that there is only one science--the science of human society, the science of human relations and practice in the process of self reconstruction, social reconstruction, and world reconstruction. In fact, humanity is best understood as a hologram of the various particular forms it assumes in various sociohistorical forms and times. Thus, Ethnic Studies, the topic for today, represents studies of the various particular forms humanity assumes under various sociohistorical conditions. Ethnic Studies is, thus, a valid enterprise. It is a valid enterprise because it is an important step toward understanding humanity in its complex and interrelated diversity.

You see, the force reflects the whole, even as the whole contains within it models of the point, so that there is always an interrelationship. I want to stress that, because I don't want you to come to the conclusion that I am talking isolationism; I am showing you that everything is interrelated, and unless we see it as a totality of interrelated points, we won't understand it. People make the mistake of separating things and talking about everything in total isolation, as if they lived in the sky or in the water or to the edge of the earth. We don't care to exist on the edge of this country, and we don't exist on the edge of this earth. We are in the thick and at the heart of a very important society. I am of the opinion that by studying us, the diverse nationalities of America, we get a good understanding of what Americans are like. And that is why ethnic groups, especially Afro-Americans, have been America's most stringent self-criticism, its most stringent internal self-criticism. So we're not talking about Ethnic Studies--I'm talking essentially about America's most important self-criticism. It's a big historical project, a big historical task, but I think it's a correct task and a necessary task. Ethnic Studies are also important, because they are a counter-thrust, an oppositional alternative to established orders which have been idealized for centuries. They are a critical corrective to the pseudoscientific lies of the established order.

Ethnic Studies are also important because they are an essential effort in the rescue and reconstruction of the history of humanity of Third World people. You see, black, brown, red and yellow humanity have been denied and deformed, and therefore there is a need to rescue and reconstruct this in our own image, to take our destiny and daily lives in our own hands and begin to step back on the stage of human history as free, proud and progressive pople. And that essential effort will begin when we dare believe in the possibility and dare accept the fact that everything is in motion, that the most characteristic aspect of the world is that it is fluid, it is changing, that what exists is going out and that what is right is certainly growing stronger and is becoming the dominant theme in human history.

Ethnic Studies is a good place to begin, and Ethnic Studies took that upon itself in the 1960's. It began as a nationalist enterprise first, which shocks those of us who have once been nationalists and have now become socialists. It shocks us because we would like to believe that we were always socialists. But in fact, socialism doesn't come all at once. It comes through work and historical practice--and so did the socialist content of Ethnic Studies as it first took a nationalist form. That's the problem of dealing with nationalism. This morning I wanted to raise the question about what is this we are saying about nationalism, and it was pointed out that we would get to that in the discussion. But in order for you to understand the content in which I speak, I want you to understand that I think that Ethnic Studies must be not only based on nationalism, but also on socialism. Not only upon socialism, but also on nationalism. I will explain myself in a moment.

What is this, that when we start talking about nationalism we immediately find blocks in peoples' minds? It is for four basic reasons. We are all products of the context in which we live our lives, namely a bourgeois, capitalist and racist society. And in this society there is an academic hostility to anything that resembles ideology. So that nationalism, as an ideology, is automatically discredited because of that. Like the guy says, "I think for myself"--as if that's original. Everybody in the world says that, at least everybody in America. That's why humanity is so ideologically different; it's so strong that it actucally makes you believe that their ideas, the ideas of the ruling class, are yours. And that's the glue, the main glue that holds America together. Never before in the history of human practice and human society has there been a society with such great cooperative powers as America. America holds together not becuase it holds a gun to everyone's head, but because the values of this society have been so absorbed that people function very well within it and even oppose changing it. So that when we first talk about nationalism, the first resistance is the academic hostility to ideology.

Seond is that people usually, like I heard this morning, take the pathologies of nationalism and project them as paradigms, as the models of nationalism. Certainly if you take the nationalism of Hitler and use that to discredit the nationalism of Karenga, you've got a good thing going. You'd convince any audience. If you take the pathology of chauvinism, where everybody is wrong but your own group, or jingoism, where you want to knock everybody out of the box militarily, we can't defend nationalism in those contexts. So that is the second problem.

The third problem we have in accepting nationalism in the mainly liberal position, and Marxists sometimes take that same position, but it is centrally a liberal position, that human diversity automatically means human division. My contention as a human is that human diversity is not the source of human division, that human diversity is in fact human ritual, and that I will not sacrifice my identity to make peace with you. There is no need. It is the capitalists that divide us; there is a certain socioeconomic arrangement that thrives on division, and that takes advantage of diversity and turns it into antagonistic division.

The fourth and final thing is a theoretical clumsiness that confuses, conveniently most of the time, the nationalism of an oppressor nation with the nationalism of an oppressed nationality or nation. The nationalism of an oppressor nation is obviously antagonistic to human cooperation. This is obviously the thing it is supposed to do. But the nationalism of an oppressed nation or nationality is a liberational project, and all critical thinkers, socialists and nationalists alike, have to support that.

We have to see nationalism for what it is. Strip it of all its mystification and look for what it actually is. Nationalism is a central national self, consciousness and concern that expresses itself on three basic levels.

First, it is an ideological formulation that is both reactive and proactive. It is reactive to racism. If white said "Black is ugly," the blacks would say "Black is beautiful." If white said "Brown is powerless," the browns would say, "Brown power." And it's just like that. Before the coming of the Europeans to Africa, you didn't have Africans going up and down the Nile saying, "Oh, how beautiful black you are." There was no need to concentrate on that. But when your humanity has been challenged, when your history has been denied and deformed and made a footnote in somebody else's history, you become very concerned with your identity. And people that this happens to understand it--it's just that they have a problem when it happens to other people. Then they get very irrational, and wonder "Why should you think that way?"

So nationalism first takes an ideological form and is reactive, but then it is also proactive. One of the criticisms I have of liberalism and Marxism is that they have the wrong attitude toward nationalism. Liberalism says that it is the social psychology, that the only reason we are nationalists is that white folks won't integrate us into their society, that really all that we do is make a pathological reaction to white oppression, that we have no historical initiative. Marxism says that nationalism is a false consciousness, a strategy of the bourgeoisie which again deprives us of our historical initiative. National consciousness is no more false than class consciousness. If we take the Marxist outlook that the true identity of the human person is its species identity--if that's so, if you mean that

110

nationalism is wrong because it disguises your human wholeness class also disguises your human wholeness and cuts you off from people you should be allied with. So we cannot just argue that it is just a strategy of the bourgeoisie; certainly the bourgeoisie uses that to create national chauvinism between people but nationlism is more clearly defined, as I said before, as a social strategy and a struggle for community. It is very important to remember that.

So actively, nationalism becomes less and less spontaneous and becomes more and more critical. It begins to devise ways and means to actually project our interests, to study our practice in America, and to devise solutions to get out of our oppression and exploitation. Second, nationalism is a social corrective, a collection of strategies and programs that actually erase and eliminate the impositions placed on us by the dominant society. It takes religious, political and cultural forms. Third, nationalism becomes a collective vocation; by that I mean a struggle for community. The state might wither away, but the nation won't. There is never any discussion in Marxism about what would happen to the nation--only about what would happen to the state. Certain bureaucracies would find themselves useless once people take the affairs of their daily lives into their own hands. But there would always be a need for a community of significant others that relate to you in terms of views and values and that can combine with you in a historic project to make a new life, a new man, woman and child.

But everything changes. And as Ethnic Studies started out as a nationalist enterprise, now they have taken on a socialist content. The question of where do we go from there is essentially "How much socialism, and how quickly can we add it to the Ethnic Studies programs?" Why is that? Because out of the struggles to establish Black studies and black power, there were failures as well as victories. What we discovered was that there is a dual character to our oppression, and therefore a need for a dual thrust to relieve us of that pressure. We understood that there was not only racial oppression, but also class exploitation, and that a correct approach would have to take consideration of both class and race. Not only because that is the way it is in practice, but also in terms of 90% of Black people being working class, and therefore a force for the future.

Racism is a social practice; it is not just an attitude, so that we can just forget it. We don't expect people to all of a sudden wake up and start hating us because a new socialist government is in power. People will stop imposing upon us when we have the power to prevent them. When it becomes unprofitable for people to discriminate against us, they will stop--but it won't come simply from lectures.

So we must have a dual thrust to our struggle--nationalism and socialism--so we have both factors of race and class. As the speaker before me said, they are neither in opposition nor mutually reducible to each other; they have to be seen in the context of the totality of capitalist society. It must be understood that capitalism uses any strategm and method it can to divide and secure its rule.

Now we have a lull. We have a time for reassessment and restructuring. And I see Ethnic Studies as a historical project that is very important in terms of Black, brown, red, and yellow people beginning to rescue and reconstruct their humanity and begin to build their future in their own image.

And in order to do that, I would like quickly to give some guidelines for those studies. 1) They should be holistic; that is to say, inclusive. Inclusive in origin, starting from the beginning--we shouldn't start our history in Mississippi, but in Africa. There is a link there, and we have to deal with time as well as place and relationship. Also speaking in terms of being holistic, I mean that variables have to be included; that it has to be a multidimensional study. It has to include race and class and any other variable, including sex, if it is necessary. We cannot go simply either for race or class, but must make an inclusive, comparative, interrelated, multidimensional and integrated analysis of everything we study.

2) Our studies have to be critical; that is to say, they must search below the surface. For it is said that if things were as they seem, there would be no need for scientific analysis. Critical also means that we must attack that which exists and bring into being that which is absent, because we know that the greatest part of truth is that

which is absent.
It is what is left out of American history that makes the truth for every study to concentrate on and build a new body of knowledge with. Next, criticism involves more than providing a catalogue of injustices that dominant people impose on you. Because what happens is that you get to cataloguing so much that you actually become involved in a myth of accomplishment. You call the guy so many names that to take action against him seems almost anticlimactic. We have got to avoid mere protest and begin to think critically.

3) The studies have to be corrected on a theoretical and practical level. That means the creation of a body of knowledge comparable to any in existence, integrated in a general criticism of capitalist, and racist society. If our body of knowledge does not measure up to the body of knowledge of other disciplines, and if it is not integrated into a general critique of this society, it will be an invalid one. You cannot build an alternative body of knowledge on protest, name calling and sloganizing. It has to be a critical, corrective study. And that requires that we actually do what? 1) Create a new model of analysis. 2) Create new categories. Why are categories so important? Because categories represent social clarity and social commitments. They represent the clarity or lack of clarity with which you view yourself, society and the world. If you use the wrong category, you can't come to the correct conclusion. Finally, it means a new cadre of socially-conscious and socially-committed

practitioners who can carry their theoretical assumptions to a practical conclusion. Why is that important? We are left out in the academic world because we are also left out socially. And the academic accomplishments only reflect what's going on in society. So if you change your relationships with society, automatically you begin to get better play in the books. But until you change social relationships, it is going to be a very hard struggle to change how you reflect it academically.

4) The last thing these studies have to have is commitment. That means a dedication to a system of views and values that make academic efforts relevant and meaningful. I mean a new commitment to man, woman and child, a new commitment to a world where we are finally able to live freely. I mean an alliance of oppressed nationalities and working class in this country in dedication to transform ourselves, society and then the world. But that means recognizing that real internationalism is more than nationalism, and becoming dedicated and bold enough to accept that.

## CARLOS MUNOZ

I would like to start with Majadi Imara's comments regarding his approach to the question of what is the political economy of higher education. I disagree with the approach he outlines, i.e., that the problem of race relations transcends the limits and boundaries of class and race, that the problem is that black people are oppressed because they are black. As Karenga has correctly pointed out, the creation of Ethnic Studies programs was due largely to the nationalist question. More specifically, to the reality that those programs were born out of the mass struggle of Thrid World people in the United States during the 1960's. The struggle at that time was waged against racism with the aim of establishing an alternative in the University. The attack we launched against racism within the institutions of higher learning was conducive to the reinterpretation of the various Third World experiences of this society. The progress made, albeit minimal, has contributed to the raising of the political consciousness of both Third World people and sectors of the white student population. The role of Ethnic Studies has been positive in that respect.

Given the realities of the kind of society we live in, the contradictions of monopoly capitalism have become clear as we have carried out the task of interpreting the nature of the oppression our respective peoples have confronted historically. The critique of racism has compelled us to move from a nationalist to a socialist pivot in terms of the development of methodology and a revolutionary ideology. There should be no disagreement that race and class are both crucial and equally important. Marxism is and should be open to criticism, very definitely. However, in our efforts to critique the obvious neglect of race and culture on the part of American Marxists as a group, we should not proceed, as Majadi has done, on the basis of anti-Marxist critiques of Marxism. There is a danger when we use people like Resnick and Franklin as references and accurate sources upon which to base our Third World critiques of Marxism. We do not put proper focus on the problem and the limitations of Marxist methodology in the effort to critically and properly interpret Third World experiences in the United States. We are living in the age of imperialism and I am firmly convinced that if Karl Marx were alive today he would be the first to revise and update his theory and methodology in order to incorporate the questions of race and culture into an analysis of class more in tune with the realities of our contemporary society. We have to understand that within the context of national liberation struggles we have to begin to deal with the principle contradiction in society. That principal contradiction is class. Ethnic Studies has to be put within the context of class struggle. Otherwise we run the risk of missing the point in terms of proper and critical interpretations of racial oppression. Racism has not been historically the root of the problems confronting Third World people today. It has contributed very much to the shaping of those problems. But the economic imperatives of imperialism have historically put racist ideology at the disposal of the ruling class to be used against Third World workers.

It must be understood clearly that what I have thus far said should not be interpreted to mean that culture and race are, or should be, of secondary concern to Ethnic Studies. The point is that we have to understand what in fact the nature of the political economy of the United States is if we are to come to grips directly with the question of what is the nature of the political economy of higher education vis-a-vis the role that Ethnic Studies must play. Look at the University of California, for example. Who sits on the Board of Regents? Who sits on the Board of Trustees of the State College system? There have been some token appointments of Chicanos and other "minorites" to both those Boards. But that ought not be interpreted as progress in the interest of Third World people. In fact, it could be interpreted to mean the opposite. Symbolic appointments to such bodies are effective propaganda for the power structures of institutions of higher learning. Such appointments are useful in projecting illusions that opportunities and access to higher education exist for Third World people.

The Chicano experience, as Chicano historians are beginning to show, has been an experience of a working class people. The 1970 census data indicates that 80% of more of Chicanos are hired in the lower echelons of the working class occupational structures. Third World people as a whole are being exploited economically. The economic exploitation of Third World workers contributes to the process of ghettoization.

There is a tendency within Ethnic Studies to deal superfically with Marxist theory. Some point out correctly that Karl Marx did not deal with racism. But they do not understand that he was not attempting to develop a theory of race relations. His theory was aimed at the interpretation of the nature of the development of societies in terms of historical materialist conditions developed over time. Economic determinism is an extreme mode of analysis that is wrongly attributed to Marx. Marx himself understood that it is equally important to develop an analysis of the superstructure of society and to wage ideological struggle against the ideas of the ruling class. Without an analysis of the superstructure we do not place proper focus on the questions of culture, race, and sex.

In advocating a class analysis as methodology for Ethnic Studies, I am not arguing that we accept Marxist their at face value. Marxist theory surely does not promise to have all the answers. But it does offer a meaningful alternative to the dominant ideology and methodology that permeate the institutions of higher learning. It becomes celar in my mind that Ethnic Studies methodology and theory cannot be developed out of a vacuum. There are two alternatives for those of us in Ethnic Studies. Either we apply those particular perspectives and analyses, models and theories that enhance the prospects to radically change the nature of our society, or we apply bourgeois methodology and theory that lend themselves to the perpetuation of that which made our country "great;" racism, sexism, and capitalism. With all its limitations, Marxist theory is clearly superior in providing us a critical insight into the true nature of our society. Now then, what does this mean to the future of Ethnic Studies? Can Ethnic Studies survive in the University if it takes a proper class stance that generates research and knowledge that contributes to the making of a socialist revolution? Or do we attempt to legitimize Ethnic Studies so that it will be acceptable to those who govern the University? These questions deserve serious attention and discussion within Ethnic Studies. My opinion is that even if we tried to legitimize ourselves we would not succeed. We must struggle within the University within the context of a commitment to popular struggles in the society, even at the risk of our individual careers. The role of Ethnic Studies is to become an integral part of the class struggle and not to perpettuate professional careerism.

In conclusion, let me say that there is a need for Ethnic Studies to develop a critical Marxist perspective and approach. It is not a question of dichotomizing nationalism and class struggle. But rather, it is a task to bring them together dialectically so that we may deal properly with the questions of race, culture, and sex, on the basis of the realities all working people face in our imperialist society.

## RONALD TAKAKI

Since I am last in line here, I thought I would make an assessment of what people have said here so far, and try to relate that assessment to practice, to the actual building, to the actual development of Ethnic Studies programs. Ultimately I think that is what this conference is about. I think we need to raise the question of how we relate Ethnic Studies to working class studies. How does this issue relate to programs which we represent at Irvine, Berkeley, UCLA, for example.

Now by listening to the panelists, I would say that essentially we are asking two questions: the first question we are asking is "Why are Third World people oppressed? Why are we oppressed?" And the second question that we are asking is "What are we going to do about it?" Or, stated another way, "What is to be done?"

Stanley Aronowitz, in his statement of the problem and his statement of the solution, defines the oppression as primarily a class oppression. He claims we must view oppression within what he calls the capitalist configuration. Majadi Imara, on the other hand, views the oppression primarily in terms of race. When asked "Why are we oppressed?", he says we are oppressed because of our race, "Black people are oppressed because they are black." Karenga, on the other hand, says we began as nationalists, then we became socialists, and now he discovers that we are socialist-nationalists.

In other words, Karenga would like to have his cake and eat it too. When we get to Carlos Munoz, we have a view that comes very close to Karenga's except that I think there is more emphasis on the Marxian class analysis. For example, he states "the Chicano experience has been primarily a working class experience, and as we move toward solutions, we have to move toward a restructuring of the base, the economic base." It seems clear that there are differing views on what constitutes the problem, and our answers to them will be different, in terms of how we then organize and develop Ethnic Studies programs in this country.

But before we can begin at that level of practice--how to develop Ethnic Studies programs in this country--it is very important to ask the question, "What is the role, what is the nature of the university?" I think it might be useful to introduce a concept from Antonio Gramsci, the concept of "cultural hegemony." Karenga uses the same concept, except he calls it "bourgeois hegemony." In other words, if you take American society as two structures, which Carolos calls the economic base and the cultural superstructure, it is important to realize that both structures interface with each other and reinforce each other in the whole systematic oppression of Third World people, women and working class people. The question we have to ask, in terms of Ethnic Studies, is "How does this university interface with these two structures?" Clearly, it interfaces at both levels. This is not an ivory tower, although I heard someone this morning say that the university is an ivory tower. The university interfaces directly with the economic substructure. We have at Davis, for example, people in the School of Agriculture actually designing mechanical harvesters under contract from the Department of Agriculture. We are, in other words, producing machinery that will be used at the base level. But more, the university also functions at the cultural superstructure level, in terms of the transmission of values and in terms of the training of people who operate, in terms of the dual labor market, at the technical level of the economy.

What we are concerned about here, primarily is the function of the university as a transmitter of values, its function in terms of the maintenance of the cultural superstructure. Karenga says that the reason why Americans--Third World and non-Third World--are docile is not because we have a gun at our heads, but because we have been conditioned to be docile, to respond spontaneously and positively to our oppression. So you don't need a lot of police in the society; what you need are some good schools. You ask why we have public high schools in this country? Our schools were established during the era of industrialization in order to teach the Irish working class a sense of time. To teach them what a clock is, so they could become obedient factory workers. Then you have higher education. Why do you need higher education? So you can have obedient intellectuals who will keep writing books in order to reconfirm the values of this society. In this type of oppression you don't need a police force, you don't need a National Guard. You don't even really need an FBI and a CIA. You need some professors. You need some schoolteachers, and books.

This then should be the way in which we define our response to the oppression, in terms of our particular role. If we were in the factories, if we were out in the fields, we would have, of course, a different kind of response. But that's not where we're at. We're in the university, and we're going to have to deal with oppression in those terms. We should begin to see oppression in terms of two structures--the economic substructure, and the cultural superstructure. The response should be, I think, what Antonio Gramsci calls "war for position on the cultural front." We have to develop the schools, the resources, the theories and evidence to deal with the scholarship that has gone on before us and the scholarship which remains dominant in American institutions of higher education.

How does one develop an Ethnic Studies program in practice? There are two theories of internal colialism, and I will show you how these theories relate to what the panelists have been saying here. We can call one theory of internal colonialism the "right theory," but let's not say that it is the right theory because it's politically on the right. The right theory of internal colonialism would view oppression primarily in terms of race. So the response then to oppression would be a nationalist response, with Blacks against whites, or Chicanos against whites, or even Third World against whites.

Then you have the "left theory" of internal colonialism. Now where are whites located, and where are Third World people located in terms of this paradigm? The dominant ruling class would be white, but not all whites would be members of that ruling class. In fact, you can find some Third World people in that ruling class. If you take Chinatown, for example, you'll find the Six Companies as part of that ruling class. The problem with this is that it is possible for certain nationalist groups to exploit this, so that you can have Third World responses that are actually consistent with capitalist ends. Take New York's Chinatown for example: Chinese businessmen can close down all the clothing factories and put 20,000 people out on the streets to protest the closure of a police substation in New York Chinatown. But who brought those people out? It was the Chinese Benevolent Association; and they wanted to reopen that police station in order to cut down crime in New York Chinatown and to help the tourist industry. So you have a nationalist response for capitalist purposes in that case. And it happens again and again, not only in Chinatown, but in barrios and ghettos.

If we take our panel in terms of the two theories of internal colonialism, I would say that Imara fits my right model and the other panelists are more consistent with the left model of internal colonialism. When we develop Ethnic Studies programs then, we have to ask whether we are developing the programs in terms of the left or right side of internal colonialism.

Now I am going to talk for a moment about the experience at Berkeley. At U.C. Berkeley, we have an Ethnic Studies Department which originally had four programs within it: Black, Chicano, Native American and Asian America. It was established in 1969 when thousands of students went on strike and demanded a college of Third World studies. What we were able to extract from the university was not a college of Third World studies with four departments, but a department of Third World studies with four programs, with the promise that there would be "sufficient flexibility" for this department to evolve into a college of Third World studies.

To a large extent, the struggles of the 1960's were, as Karenga put it, "nationalist struggles," so you have what Gramsci calls a "historic block." Different groups came together at a moment in history and worked together and established a Department of Ethnic Studies at Berkeley. However, the nationalist sentiment took the groups away from each other, so that the historic block disintegrated; and as a result, in part, one of the programs moved out of the Department of Ethnic Studies. The Black Studies Program which is now separated from Ethnic Studies, an autonomous department in the College of Letters and Sciences. So within this perspective, the struggle is defined even more narrowly--as white and black. So Blacks within the Ethnic Studies Department had no part of the whole program and no responsibility to other Third World groups. It was Blacks for Blacks only. This, however, did weaken the whole structural position of the Department of Ethnic Studies. Besides weakening the structural position of the Department of Ethnic Studies, it also weakened the structural position of the Department of Black Studies. It narrowed its base; and also, it defined the struggle, defined oppression as primarily a racial rather than a class oppression. And racial, in this instance, is to be Black--not even Third World.

The questions that we have to ask, however, are whether this is academically valid in terms of analysis, in terms of one of the questions raised by the panel this morning--that is, the paradigms of Ethnic Studies. Beyond that, does this offer us political potential to engage in a structural struggle to change the economic base, to change the cultural superstructure? These are questions that I think it is very difficult for us to resolve. I think this brings us to another question: if we are to move in terms of Ethnic Studies development toward the left theory of internal colonialism, what about the white working class? And if we are indeed going to change the economic substructure as well as the cultural superstructure, do we not, as faculty and students in Third World Studies, have a responsibility to show that we have a common working class experience? Most people in this country are members of the proletariat. We have this in common, and so we have to ask ourselves whether we in Ethnic Studies have a responsibility towards something called "class studies."

Berkeley at one time had a school of criminology, which offered class studies. This posed a threat to the university, and was eliminated subsequently. Do we then, in Third World studies, have a responsibility to develop in our own programs a component of class studies where we relate race to class? But do we, in the very way we define ourselves as a school of Ethnic Studies, exclude ourselves from the working class students? Do we need another kind of rubric? I think that essentially what we are asking here are questions raised by two important philosophers--the first was Karl Marx and the second Emile Durkheim. Both of them were asking "What is Man?" Marx said "Man's essence is his labor, his activity; and the basis of this alienation is his separation from this activity, from the process as well as the product." And hence, Marx's conclusion was that in order for man to recover his essence, he must have socialism--where he is in control of the process, and where he owns collectively the product of his activity. Emile Durkheim, on the other hand, in his answer to the question of "What is Man?" said "Man is a spiritual being.. It is not his labor which defines him, but it is his spiritual being, his associations, his culture." And I think that what we're seeing here is that the way we see man is multidimensional. Man is a cultural being. Man has a spiritual side within him. But many of us also would say that part of our essence is our activity, our labor. As Third World people, we experience the identity called superexploitation, not only in terms of the dual labor system, where you have two separate labor markets, where most of us are in the lower market and exploited in terms of lower wages. But I think Third World people are superexploited because of our alienated labor, and also because of our alienation from our culture. This is a system which separates us from our labor, and which seeks to destroy our cultures. And what people on this panel are saying is that people have two needs: we need to recover our essence in terms of our labor, and we also need to recover our essence in terms of our spirit.

And the question is: Can we satisfy both of these within a program? Do we have a program like the one in Comparative Culture, or do we have it as we have it at Berkeley, where we have proposed our college of Third World studies, where we have comparative analyses so that we try to understand the Black experience in relationship to the Chicano, native American and Asian experience. Or do we even take it one step further and try to relate that experience to our experience as workers? How do we do it?